



# Georgia State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

## Executive Summary

The five-year Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) SPDG has five goals: (1) Increase reading and math achievement at the middle and high school level as well as the number of students who graduate with a regular diploma; (2) Reduce dropouts; (3) Increase the percent of students with disabilities achieving their Individualized Education Program (IEP) transition goals; (4) Increase the percent of employed special education teachers holding full certification; and (5) Increase the percent of children transitioning to preschool with age appropriate skills. The GaDOE has continued to partner with the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), other GaDOE Divisions and programs, other agencies, institutes of higher education (IHEs), parents, and regional/state/national resource centers to implement the GraduateFIRST Project and other SPDG goals.

**Goals 1 and 2:** During Year 4, 28 Cohort 1 schools (16 middle schools, and 12 high schools) and 61 Cohort 2 schools (13 middle schools and 48 high schools) continued to implement scientifically-based interventions related to selected Priority Improvement Areas. During Year 4, 53 additional Cohort 3 schools participated in the GraduateFIRST project (24 high schools, 21 middle schools, 6 Mountain Education Centers, and two statewide behavior support programs). As of Year 4 of the SPDG (2011), a total of 142 Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 schools were implementing programs and strategies to improve graduation rates and reduce dropouts for students with and without disabilities.

The 89 Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools were in early implementation during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years (Years 2 and 3 of the SPDG). Data probes were used to obtain baseline data for Cohorts 1, 2, and 3. Baseline data was compared to 2009-2010 (the second year of implementation for Cohort 1 and the first year of implementation for Cohort 2)—essentially Year 3 of the SPDG. This analysis is included within performance measures 1/2i – 1/2r, as well as Tables 6-15 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment. The SPDG Year 4 probe data (third year of Cohort 1 implementation and second year of Cohort 2 implementation) will not be available until after submission of the Annual Performance Report, but will be reported on in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Report.

An overall analysis of Cohort 1's third year of implementation (2009-2010) and the Cohort 2's second year of implementation show that both the middle and high schools are making positive gains in English/Language Arts as well as math achievement. Additional positive gains were evidenced by a small percentage point loss in absenteeism over 15 days from baseline to 2009-2010. Both the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools also made positive gains in graduation and a reduced dropout rates for students with disabilities. Baseline probe data was gathered during Year 4 of the SPDG for all newly selected Cohort 3 middle and high schools. This baseline data will be compared to their first year of implementation (Year 5 of the SPDG) and included in next year's Year 5 Annual Performance Report.

During Years 1 and 2, a GLRS Collaboration Coach was assigned to each of the participating Cohort 1 schools to provide ongoing assistance as the schools implemented activities/initiatives related to their Action Plans. During Years 3 and 4, this support model shifted to local support being provided by School Team Leaders, with the Collaboration Coaches supporting the School Team Leaders. Monthly meetings were held between the Collaboration Coaches and School Team Leaders to provide support to the Team Leaders and to monitor implementation progress toward the selected Priority Improvement Areas. In addition to monthly meetings with Collaboration Coaches and School Teams, several fidelity of imple-

mentation procedures are discussed in this Year 4 Report.

To promote additional parent engagement, the Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉ) project, was piloted during Years 1-2 in two schools—Manchester High School in Meriwether county and Rutland High School in Bibb county. In Year 3, a third CAFÉ was implemented in Elbert County High School in Elbert County. All three CAFÉs have been promoting strategies to reduce dropouts and increase graduation rates. These three CAFÉs continued their work during Year 4 and the concept of MiniCAFÉs was introduced in three additional school districts.

**Goal 3:** A long-range goal is to have a total of at least 12 Regional Transition Councils in the GLRS regions. At the end of the Year 3 SPDG performance period, there were six operational Regional Transition Councils. Three additional Regional Transition Councils (Cohort 3) held their first meeting in fall 2010 (Year 4 of the SPDG): Metro South GLRS (Griffin), Southeast Georgia GLRS (Waycross) and West Georgia GLRS (Grantville). Several others are in the work group phase. With the additional Councils being created by these three Cohort 4 Regional Council work groups, a total of 12 Regional Interagency Transition Councils will be operational during Year 5.

During 2009-2010, 19 school districts were required to receive assistance in order to meet the state's Indicator 13 in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Eighteen school systems have been provided technical assistance from two consultants in transition training, planning. Follow-up support has been tailored to each school district based on a review of actual transition plans evaluation based on a rubric. Seven transition trainings were held during Year 4 for 297 school district personnel.

During Year 4, the Active Student Participation Inspires Real Engagement (ASPIRE) project was initiated in order to implement student-led IEPs as a way of improving the quality of IEPs, including transition plans. Project ASPIRE is being implemented for 72 students in 12 schools. Of the total 12 schools, six are Cohort 1, 2, or 3 schools. During Year 4, ten student led IEP trainings were held for 87 participants.

**Goal 4:** The GaDOE worked with a task force during Year 3 to develop standards and a model of support for a pilot teacher induction program for special education teachers. Training began in June for site administrators regarding effective hiring of Induction Coaches. Five school districts are participating in the pilot induction program. Seventeen trainings were held during Year 4 for 215 Induction Coaches, beginning teachers, and school administrators. Perception data gathered during Year 4 shows positive impact of induction efforts on the beginning special education teachers, as well as their students with disabilities.

**Goal 5:** Due to unforeseen issues, the trainings provided on the *Get Ready to Read* early literacy program did not result in implementation of the early literacy program during Year 4. The work of five Early Literacy Communities of Practice supported by Parent to Parent of Georgia was reported on in this Year 4 SPDG Annual Performance Report. Impact data should be available in Year 5 of the SPDG.

Helping students with disabilities stay in school and graduate requires well-qualified teachers. During 2009-2010, 92.0 percent of all special education teachers were highly qualified, compared to 91.4% in 2008-2009. Of the total special education teachers employed in 2009-2010, 82.5% were retained for a two -year period, compared to 89.0% and 95.6% in the previous two-year periods. The small downward fluctuation in 2009 and 2010 may be in part attributed to the economic stress schools were under, requiring them to reduce staff to meet budgetary requirements.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # H323A070012

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

The Georgia SPDG goals and objectives are being carried out within the context of the GaDOE Secondary Redesign Initiative using the Georgia Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions (GPI). A description of the GPI is found in the Year 1 SPDG Annual Performance Report narrative. Within the GaDOE, the Division of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (CIA) including Reading First, School Improvement, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE) has been collaborating throughout Years 1-4 of the SPDG with the Division for Special Education Services and Supports to ensure that the needs of all students (including students with disabilities) are addressed. The Georgia SPDG workscope is also closely aligned with the Georgia State Performance Plan (SPP).

The SPDG activities are being carried out in coordination with the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS). The GLRS is a statewide network of 17 regional centers focused on providing ongoing professional learning to teachers and administrators that will assist them in implementing effective instructional strategies that impact the performance of students with disabilities and other struggling students. The GLRS Centers collaborate with a statewide network of 16 Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs) that have been established to assist school systems in improving educational programs and services for all children.

Goals 1 and 2 are aimed at providing support in selected Priority Improvement Areas to 16 middle schools and 12 high schools in Cohort 1, as well as to 48 middle schools and 13 high schools in Cohort 2, who began their work in Year 3. During Year 4, Cohort 3 began implementation of scientifically based strategies to reduce dropouts and increase graduation rates. Cohort 3 includes 53 additional schools (21 middle schools, 24 high schools, six Mountain Education Centers, and two statewide behavior support programs). A total of 142 Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools are participating in this SPDG supported GraduateFIRST program.

**Selection of Cohort Schools**

Following training provided during Year 1 of the SPDG, 34 middle and high schools within the GLRS regions were selected to participate in the SPDG improvement efforts in Cohort 1 based upon areas of concern from an analysis of state and local data. The Cohort 1 schools continued their implementation efforts during Years 2-4 with some attrition. As of Year 4, 28 Cohort 1 schools (16 middle schools and 12 high schools) are participating in the GraduateFIRST program supported by the SPDG. Table 1 in the Annual Report Attachment provides a listing of Cohort 1 schools.

Replication/expansion occurred during Year 3 with the addition of Cohort 2, consisting of 61 schools (13 middle schools and 48 high schools). Table 2 in the Annual Report Attachment provides a listing of the Cohort 2 schools participating in Year 4.

During Year 4, Cohort 3 was formed with an additional 53 participating Cohort 3 schools (21 middle schools, 24 high schools, six Mountain Education Centers, and two behavior support program). A listing of Cohort 3 schools is found in Table 3 in the Report Attachment.

As of Year 4, a total of 142 Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools are implementing programs and strategies to improve graduation rates and reduce dropout rates for students with and without disabilities.

### **Data Probes**

In order to establish a sustainable technical assistance and replication capacity, all of the Cohort 1, 2, and 3 participating schools have identified a dropout prevention team with a School Team Leader. With the support of their regional GLRS Collaboration Coach, the GaDOE, and some initial support from the National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), school teams from each of the participating high schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 have compiled and analyzed baseline data in the following probes: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status, language arts/reading achievement, math achievement, absenteeism, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, referrals, graduation rates for all students and students with disabilities, and dropout rates for all students and students with disabilities. Participating Cohort 1, 2, and 3 middle school probes included: AYP status, language arts/reading achievement, math achievement, absenteeism, in-school suspensions, full-day referrals, and out-of-school suspension referrals.

### **Selection of Priority Areas**

Based on a review of baseline data reviewed by school-based teams, Priority Improvement Areas were selected for targeted intervention. Table 3 in the Year 3 SPDG Annual Report Attachment provides a summary of Priority Improvement Areas selected by the Cohort 1 participating middle and high schools. Table 4 contains a summary of the Priority Improvement Areas that have been chosen for implementation by the Cohort 2 schools. Priority Improvement Areas that have been chosen for implementation by the Cohort 3 schools are found in Table 5 in the Annual Report. Following is a summary of Year 4 Priority Improvement Areas for Cohorts 2 and 3.

#### **Cohort 2:**

Math - 31 Schools  
Affective - 23 Schools  
Behavior – 8 Schools  
Academics – 2 Schools  
Engagement – 3 Schools  
Attendance – 2 Schools  
CAFES/ASPIRE – 1 School

#### **Cohort 3:**

Math – 25 Schools  
Affective - 11 Schools

Behavior – 6 Schools  
Academics – 6 Schools  
Engagement – 2 Schools  
Attendance – 6 Schools  
Cognitive Engagement – 2 Schools  
Inclusion – 1 School  
Improving Grades – 1 School  
Family Engagement – 1 School

### **Development of Action Plans**

Cohort 1 school-based teams developed Action Plans including research-based programs and strategies during Year 1 for implementation during Years 2, 3, and 4. Cohort 2 school-based teams developed Action Plans during Year 3 for implementation during Years 3 and 4. Finally, Cohort 3 school-based teams developed Action Plans during Year 4 for early implementation. These Action Plans contained detailed interventions to be carried out related to the selected Priority Improvement Areas.

### **Training and Support**

During Years 1 and 2 of the SPDG, the SPDG Collaboration Coaches provided direct support to the participating Cohort 1 middle and high schools in their regions to assist them in the implementation of Action Plans. Collaboration Coaches received NDPC-SD and SPDG staff training during Years 1 and 2 as a member of the school-based team.

During the Year 3 and the current Year 4, the GLRS Collaboration Coaches worked more directly with the school team leaders, with the expectation that the school team leaders provide support to their schools in the implementation of Priority Improvement activities related to dropout prevention. Monthly meetings by the Collaboration Coaches were held with the school team leaders to discuss progress being made toward the selected Priority Improvement Areas. In turn, school team leaders held regularly scheduled meetings with their school teams. The GaDOE also held monthly meetings with the Collaboration Coaches to provide training and support, as well as to review the progress toward implementation of Action Plans across the state. These meetings provided consistency and accountability throughout the state.

Ongoing face-to-face training and webinars via Eluminate were also provided throughout Years 1-4. For example, Performance Measure 1/2b discusses 11 math trainings carried out during Year 4 of the SPDG. Performance measure 1.2d discusses Planet Literacy training provided and examples of re-delivery/follow-up in the Cohort schools.

### **Fidelity of Implementation**

Following is a summary of procedures implemented during Years 4 to ensure fidelity of implementation of school Action Plans:

- Monthly meetings by the GaDOE and the Collaboration Coaches.

- Monthly meetings between the Collaboration Coaches and school team leaders.
- Regularly-scheduled meetings by the school team leaders with school teams.
- Consistent use across the state of forms and procedures contained in the GraduateFIRST Implementation Manual.
- Monthly team leader agendas and minutes submitted for review by GaDOE.
- Monthly logs utilized by the Collaboration Coaches.
- Reports submitted monthly by the third party evaluators of the team leader agendas, minutes and the monthly log activities of the Collaboration Coaches.
- Progress monitoring of targeted students in each Cohort school with a GraduateFIRST assessment tool in the areas of attendance, in-school suspension, and course failures.
- Other assessment tools measuring student performance including walk-through observations, surveys, benchmarks, logs, charts, and student portfolios.
- Annual outcome assessment of baseline vs. current year data on the data probes discussed earlier.
- End-of-year survey to gather information regarding Action Plan implementation and perceived benefits of support from Collaboration Coaches and school-based team leaders.

In addition to Goals 1 and 2, the Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools are benefitting from Goal 3 (transition), Goal 4 (recruitment and retention of fully qualified special education teachers), and Goal 5 (early intervention) of the Georgia SPDG, along with other school systems throughout Georgia.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Federal Performance Measures – All Georgia SPDG Goals:**

**Goal 1:** Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.

**Goal 2:** The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of school will be reduced by 50% through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavior interventions.

**Goal 3:** Students with disabilities and other students at risk for school failure will have effective transition in school and from school to post school outcomes.

**Goal 4:** Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

**Goal 5:** Parents of preschool children within the targeted schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 will increase participation to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.

1-5.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
The percent of personnel receiving professional development through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices (Federal Measure 1.1).	PROGRAM PROJECT	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
						100	5,421/5,732

1-5.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		

The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (Federal Performance Measure 2.1).	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	80		88/98	89.8

<b>1-5.c Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of SPDG projects that have implemented personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies identified in their State Performance Plan (SPP) (Federal Performance Measure 1.2).	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	80		98/98	100

<b>1-5.d Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG, that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices; e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc. (Federal Performance Measure 2.2).	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	75		82/98	83.7

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**1-5a/b – Implementation of Scientifically-Based Professional Development (Federal Performance Measures 1.1 and 2.1)**

**Percent of personnel receiving scientifically-based professional development through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional practices (Federal Performance Measure 1.1).**

**The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG based on scientific-or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices (Federal Performance Measure 2.1).**

**Goal 1: Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.**



## Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:

In the past several years, multiple consensus reports have provided a converging body of knowledge about the nature of effective instruction for children at risk for reading problems (Donavoon and Cross, 2002; National Reading Panel, 2000; Rand Reading Study Group, 2002; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). The scientifically based researched (SBR) reading content of Goal 1 professional development incorporates the following five components identified by the National Reading Panel as essential components of an effective reading instruction program: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension. The literature discusses SBR interventions to enhance student engagement and learning such as the Strategic Instruction Model or SIM, which is an umbrella term that embraces a model of teacher-focused (Content Enhancement) and student-focused interventions (Learning Strategies), as well as other support pieces. The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning has shown academic gains when using several SIM strategies—see for example: Woodruff, S., Schumaker, J.B., and Deshler, D.D. (2002); Desler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Lenz, K.B. Bulgren, J.A., Hock, M.F., Knight, J., and Ehren, B.J. (2002).

The Georgia training in math has incorporated research-based practices in effective math interventions. Four national advisory panels have been appointed since 1999 to provide advice and assistance on how best to teach mathematics: The National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century, National Research Council, the RAND Mathematics Study Panel, and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel. The reports emerging from each of the advisory panels explain what each expert panel concluded schools must teach and students learn in math. What these reports make clear is that mathematics teaching and learning are complex. The National Research Council refers to “mathematical proficiency” as five intertwined strands (Kilpatrick, Swafford, and Findell, 2001). Learning each of these strands is an ongoing process that builds on itself. As new concepts and skills are learned, new terms and symbols must also be learned and older skills remembered and applied.

The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel (2008) speaks clearly to the need for math curricula that fosters student success in algebra (and beyond) and experienced math teachers who use researched-based instructional strategies. The report also stresses the “mutually reinforcing benefits of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and automatic recall of facts” (National Mathematics Advisory Panel, 2008, p. xiv). The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel Report (2008) further investigates successful mathematical teaching strategies and provides additional support for the research results.

According to these studies, four methods of instruction show the most promise. These are:

- **Systematic and explicit instruction**-a detailed instructional approach in which teachers guide students through a defined instructional sequence. Within systematic and explicit instruction students learn to regularly apply strategies that effective learners use as a fundamental part of mastering concepts.
- **Self-instruction**- through which students learn to manage their own learning with specific prompting or solution-oriented questions.
- **Peer tutoring**- an approach that involves pairing students together to learn or practice an academic task.
- **Visual representation**-uses manipulatives, pictures, number lines, and graphs of functions and relationships to teach mathematical concepts.

There is a growing body of knowledge regarding effective math instruction for students with disabilities, especially students who have been identified with a learning disability (LD). There have been five meta-analyses on the subject, reviewing a total of 183 research studies (Adams & Carnine, 2003; Baker, Gersten, and Lee, 2002; Browder, Spooner, Ahlgrim-DeLzell, Harris, and Wakeman, 2008; Kroesbergen and Van Luit, 2003; Xin and Jitendra, 1999). The studies combined in these meta-analyses involved students with a variety of disabilities—most notably, LD, but other disabilities as well, including mild mental retardation, attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD), behavioral disorders, and students with significant cognitive disabilities. The meta-analyses found strong evidence of instructional approaches that appear to help students with disabilities improve their math achievement.

These and other promising directions for effective math instruction are identified by Grouws and Ceulla (2000) and can increase student learning and have a positive effect on student achievement:

1. Increasing the extent of the students' opportunity to learn (OTL) mathematics content.
2. Focusing instruction on the meaningful development of important mathematical ideas.
3. Providing learning opportunities for both concepts and skills by solving problems.
4. Giving students both an opportunity to discover and invent new knowledge and an opportunity to practice what they have learned.
5. Incorporating intuitive solution methods, especially when combined with opportunities for student interaction and discussion.
6. Using small groups of students to work on activities, problems, and assignments (e.g., small groups, Davidson, 1985; cooperative learning, Slavin, 1990; peer assisted learning and tutoring, Baker, et al., 2002).
7. Whole-class discussion following individual and group work.
8. Teaching math with a focus on number sense that encourages students to become problem solvers in a wide variety of situations and to view math as important for thinking.
9. Use of concrete materials on a long-term basis to increase achievement and improve attitudes toward math.

The Georgia professional development in math is incorporating these and other evidence-based practices supported by research, including careful progress monitoring and reinforcement of programs, the use of technology, curriculum-based interventions, and differentiated instruction.

A new literacy training was added in Year 4 of the SPDG—Planet Literacy. Planet Literacy was built on the research regarding active literacy and the findings of the National Reading Panel. The training contains strategies for active literacy in building the components of reading, vocabulary, and writing-to-learn in the modules. Planet Literacy training in Year 4 was based on strategies to get students actively engaged in vocabulary and other literacy/reading components. The training contains ten scripted modules with an accompanying PowerPoint for re-delivery. Feedback from Georgia training participants indicated that this program contains strategies that are easy to take back to the classroom and ready for immediate use.

The Georgia Student Achievement Pyramid of Interventions professional development has been developed within Georgia's Secondary Redesign Initiative as a way to align all efforts and ongoing initiatives within the GaDOE so that there is a common focus and language regarding instructional practices and interventions for all students. Research synthesis findings indicated that there is an emerging body of empirical evidence to support RTI as an effective process for identifying children at-risk for learning difficulties particularly at the elementary level. GaDOE has developed a manual and ongoing professional development webinars through Elluminate.

Parent engagement is a powerful influence in student educational success and a strong predictor of a child’s achievement. Therefore, parent and family engagement activities are woven throughout all of the Georgia SPDG goals. A research review of some 300 studies by Kellaghan, et al., (1994), 49 studies by Edge and Davis (1994), 66 studies by Henderson & Berla (1994), and studies by Henderson and Mapp (2002) demonstrated that the family makes crucial contributions to student achievement. This is true across socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and educational backgrounds and for students of all ages (Mapp, 2004). These reviews also concluded that the earlier in a child’s educational process the parents and family are involved, the better the results. Redding, et al., (2004) showed that a critical mass of comprehensive and focused school-home activities can be generated in a relatively short period of time.

Coleman, et al., (2006) identified three necessary components for effectively involving parents in the schools: 1. Key information for parents about what their child is learning and how well they are learning; 2. Engagement activities for the parents to provide direct support for their child’s learning; and 3. Advocacy by parents so that their child receives necessary support. Epstein (2001) argued for the following parental roles to improve schools: volunteering, supporting their child’s learning at home, having meaningful roles for decision making in the schools, and collaboration with the community.

Georgia’s Parent Training Information (PTI) Center, Parent to Parent of Georgia, GaDOE’S Parent Mentor Program, and a coalition of Georgia parent and advocacy groups work together as strategic parent engagement activities are included in Goal 5 and imbedded into the other SPDG goals.

Performance measure 1.4 details the work related to implementation of Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉs) a method or a process of collaborative team problem solving on the local/community level to improve student achievement. The CAFÉ team typically includes at least three family members and several building-level decision makers. The team focuses on identifying and launching sustainable initiatives/activities to impact student success. CAFÉ dialogue meetings are approximately two hours.

During Year 2, SPDG staff supported the implementation of pilot CAFÉs in two schools/counties—Manchester High School (Meriwether County) and Rutland High School (Bibb County). A new CAFÉ was initiated during Year 3 in Elbert High School, Elbert County Schools. The goal of the three CAFÉ’s has been to create short-term and long-term solutions. These three CAFÉs continued their work during Year 4 and a more streamlined initiative, MiniCAFÉs, aimed at targeting 1 goal in a school started in three new schools.,

### **Selected References:**

- Baker, S., Gersten, R., and Lee, D. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low achieving students. *The Elementary School Journal* 103(1), 51-73.
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE) – <http://www.bestevidence.org>.
- Rachel Billmeyer & Barton, Mary Lee – *Teaching Reading in the Content Areas: If Not Me, Then Who?*
- Browder, D. M., Spooner, F., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Harris, A., & Wakeman, S. Y., (2008). A meta-analysis on teaching mathematics to students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 74(4), 407-432.

- Burns, M.S., Griffin, P., & Snow, C.E. (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promote children's reading success*. Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Center on Instruction – <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/index.cfm>.
- Coleman, M.R., Buysee, V., and Neitzel, J. (2006). Recognition and response: An early intervening system for young children at-risk for learning disabilities. Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.
- Coleman, A.L., Starzynski, A.L., Winnick, S.Y., Palmer, S.R., and Furr, J.E. (2006). *It takes a parent: Transforming education in the wake of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Appleseed.
- Daniels, Harvey & Zemelman, Steven - *Subjects Matter Every Teacher's Guide to Content-Area Reading*
- Daniels Harvey, Zemelman, Steven, and Steineke - *Content-Area Writing: Every Teacher's Guide*
- Davison, N. (1985). Small group cooperative learning in mathematics: A selective view of the research. In R. Slavin (Ed.), *Learning to cooperate: Cooperating to learn*. (211-30). NY; Plenum.
- Desler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Lenz, K.B., Bulgren, J.A., Hock, M.F., Knight, J., and Ehren, B.J. (2002). *The strategic intervention model*. Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.
- Donovan, M.S., & Cross, C.T. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Grouws, D. A. and Cebulla, K.J. (December 2002, Updated June 2003) *Improving student achievement in mathematics. Part 1: Research findings and Part 2: Recommendations for the classroom*. ERIC Digest, Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education.
- Harvey, Stephanie and Goudvis, A. *Strategies that Work Teaching Comprehension for Understanding and Engagement*
- Henderson, A.T., & Berla, N. (Eds.). (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. National Committee for Citizens in Education: Washington, DC.
- Henderson, A., and Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX; Southwest Educational Laboratory.
- Kellaghan, T.K., Sloane, B., and Alvarez, & Bloom, B.S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., National Early Literacy Panel. (2006, March). *Findings from the National Early Literacy Panel: Providing a focus for early language and literacy development*. Presentation.
- Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (Eds.). (2001). Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the National Academies Press Web site: [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=9822](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=9822)
- Kroesbergen, E. H., & Van Luit, J. E. H. (2003). Mathematics interventions for children with special educational needs. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*(2), 97–114.
- Mapp, K. (2004). *Family engagement*. In F.P. Schargel and J. Simink (Eds.), *Helping students graduate: A strategic approach to dropout prevention* (pp. 99-113). Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.
- Marzano, Robert, Debra Pickering, and Jane Pollack – *Classroom Instruction that Works*
- Marzano, Robert - *Building Background Knowledge*
- National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century. (2000). *Before it's too late: A report to the nation from the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/inits/Math/glenn/index.html>
- National Mathematics Advisory Panel. (2008). *Foundations for success: The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/mathpanel/report/final-report.pdf>
- National Research Council—*Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog>

- National Reading Panel (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching students to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Reports of the subgroups. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.
- Rand Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- RAND Mathematics Study Panel. (2003). *Mathematical proficiency for all students: Toward a strategic research and development program in mathematics education*. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the Rand Web site: [http://rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1643/](http://rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1643/)
- Slavin, R.E. (1990). Student team learning in mathematics. In N. Davidson (Ed.), *Cooperative learning in math: A handbook for teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, (69-102).
- Southern Regional Education Board - *Literacy Across the Curriculum, Setting and Implementing Goals for Grades Six through 12*
- Spicuzza, R., and Ysseldyke, J. (1999). Using accelerated math to enhance instruction in a mandated summer school program. Minn, MN: National Center on Educational Outcomes. Available at; <http://education.umn.edu/nceo/onlinepubs/amreport.pd>.
- Karen Tankersley, Karen – *Literacy Strategies for Grades 4-12*
- Tovani, Chris – *Do I Really Have to Teach Reading?*
- Tompkins, Gail E. & Blanchfield, Cathy - *Teaching Vocabulary*
- Richard and JoAnne – Authors of multiple textbooks on literacy and reading across the curriculum
- VanKleek, A., Gillam, R., & McFadden, T. (1998). “A study of classroom-based phonological awareness training for preschoolers with speech and/or language disorders.” *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 7, 65-76.
- What Works Clearinghouse - <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
- Wilcox, M. (1999). “Considerations in promoting language-based learning readiness for children enrolled in Head Start.” In J. Heller (Ed.). *Head Start University Partnerships: Issues in Child Development Research*.
- Woodruff, S., Schumaker, J.B., and Deshler, D.D. (2002). *The effects of an intensive reading intervention on the decoding skills of high school students with reading deficits*. (Research Report No. 15). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.
- Ysseldyke, J. & Tandre, S. (2006). Use of a program monitoring system to enable teachers to differentiate math instruction. Manuscript in Progress.
- Xin, Y. P., & Jitendra, A. K. (1999). The effect of instruction in solving mathematical word problems for students with learning problems: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Special Education*, 32(4), 207–225.

## **Goal 2 – Reduction of students with disabilities dropping out of school through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavioral interventions.**

### **Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:**

Professional development provided within Goal 2 incorporates findings from the dropout prevention literature. For example, an early 1990's study of three dropout prevention programs for students with disabilities found that six components were common to all effective programs: persistence, continuity and consistency; monitoring; relationships; affiliation; and problem-solving skills (Lehr et al., 2004). Lehr et al (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of dropout research and found that of the 300 studies reviewed, only forty-five studies could be coded; and only nine had some form of randomized design. Only two conducted since 1994 were focused on high school students and had a randomized-control element in the evalua-

tion. The following, however, were identified as promising practices and are being incorporated within the Georgia SPDG:

- *Personal/affective interventions.* Examples include activities designed to enhance self-esteem, regularly scheduled classroom-based discussion, individual counseling, and participation in lessons on interpersonal relations.
- *Academic interventions.* Examples include provision of special academic courses, individualized methods of instruction, and tutoring.
- *Family outreach strategies.* Examples include increased feedback to parents and home visits.
- *Interventions addressing school structure.* Examples include creating schools within schools, re-defining of the role of the homeroom teacher, and reducing class size.
- *Work-related interventions.* Examples include vocational training and participation in volunteer or service programs.

Bost and Riccomini (2006) researched effective instruction and school engagement strategies to prevent students with disabilities from dropping out and to assist students in an effective planning process. They reported on the following principles of effective instructional and school engagement strategies: (1) Maximize active engagement (i.e., time on task) or the amount of work that is diagnostically and instructionally appropriate; (2) Create an instructional environment that encourages successful social and academic experiences; (3) Provide maximum time for students to have the opportunity to learn content; (4) Group for instruction to facilitate the teacher's ability to keep students engaged in the classroom; (5) Scaffold instruction with carefully and systematically sequenced series of prompted content, materials, tasks, and teacher support; (6) Address all forms of knowledge (procedural, declarative, and conditional knowledge); (7) Organize information so that the student can build on previously learned knowledge and skills; (8) Provide instruction that teaches students how to learn; (9) Make instruction explicit; and (10) Purposefully design instruction to help students recognize patterns and organize knowledge.

Lehr, et al., (2003) found the Check and Connect Model to be effective in preventing dropout and increasing school engagement. The Check and Connect Model is designed to engage students in school and learning via a mentor/monitor who establishes a long-term relationship and maintains regular contact with the student, family, and teachers. Risk factors are systematically monitored, and interventions are tailored to meet individual student needs such as increased communication with parents, tutoring, and problem-solving (Sinclair, et al., 1998; and Lehr, et al., 2005). Ninety-four students were randomly assigned to a treatment or control group (n=47 each). Analysis found that students who received the Check and Connect intervention were more likely to still be enrolled after one year in the program (ninety-one percent vs. seventy percent) and more likely to graduate from high school within four years (46 percent vs. 20 percent). SPDG schools use models based on the principles of Check and Connect.

Dropout prevention and increased graduation are the broad framework in the Georgia SPDG within which dropout prevention research findings are being incorporated, as well as the implementation of scientifically based reading and math strategies, co-teaching, and a number of other interventions to improve the school climate and educational program to support student engagement and achievement.

### **Selected References:**

- Bost, L. and Riccomini, P.J. (September-October, 2006). Effective instruction: An inconspicuous strategy for dropout prevention. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(5), 301-311.
- Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., & Thurlow, M. L. (2005). Promoting school completion of urban secondary youth with emotional or behavioral disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 71(4), 465-482.

- Lehr, C.A., Sinclair, M.F., and Christenson, S.L. (2004). Addressing school engagement and truancy prevention in the elementary school: A replication study of the check and connect model, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9(3), 279-301.
- Lehr, C. A., Hansen, A., Sinclair, M. F., & Christenson, S. L. (2003). Moving beyond dropout prevention to school completion: An integrative review of data-based interventions, *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 342–364.
- Sinclair, M.F., Christenson, S.L., Lehr, C.A., and Anderson, A.R. (2003). Facilitated student engagement: Lessons learned from *Check and Connect* longitudinal studies. *The California School Psychology*, 8, 29-42.

**Goal 3: Students with disabilities and other students at risk for school failure will have effective transition in school and from school to post school outcomes.**

**Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:**

Transition from high school to postsecondary education and the workforce is a critical issue for students with disabilities, such that specific language was added to IDEA in 1997 to ensure that all students, by age 14 or earlier, would have a statement of transition services itemized in their IEP. In addition, IDEA also requires school districts to include students as participants in their transition planning meetings.

In its study, the GAO (2003) identified the problems reported by various stakeholders in the transition process. As is evident in the table, each constituency had a different viewpoint. Students noted a lack of self-advocacy training, which helps empower them to develop the necessary skills to succeed in a postsecondary environment. Parents found that lack of information and support made it difficult to navigate the transitional period. Teachers and other educators talked about the problems in linking students with postsecondary and workforce opportunities and services. Researchers focused on the lack of work-based experiences for students, a notion that was found mirrored by the researchers on the GAO panel. And finally, government officials focused on the more tangible issue of transportation for students with disabilities. All are legitimate barriers to the successful transition of students, and all have their own set of difficulties in moving toward acceptable and appropriate remedies.

In a literature synthesis, Skinner and Lindstrom (2003) identified six critical areas where students with disabilities are at a disadvantage compared to non-disabled students with regard to postsecondary education attainment: Deficits in study skills such as test preparation, note-taking, and listening comprehension; problems with organizational skills; difficulties with social interaction; deficits in specific academic areas, with reading and written composition be the most frequent; low self-esteem; and higher school dropout rates.

The National Council on Disability (2004) identified a taxonomy, developed jointly by Western Michigan University and the Transition Research Institute at the University of Illinois, of transition practices for students with disabilities (ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education, 2000). Based on an exhaustive review of the literature and reviews of model projects and exemplary programs, five program components were found to be important: student-focused planning; student development; interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration; family involvement; and effective program structures.

Skinner and Lindstrom (2003) identified the following factors that have shown empirical evidence in influencing success. These include: (a) the extent of student knowledge of the nature of their disability and compensatory strategies; (b) how able a student is to manage a disability in a

proactive manner (e.g., self-advocacy, goal setting, knowledge of disability law, selection of an appropriate college, self-identification, organizing for living and learning, etc.); (c) the availability of emotional and academic support; (d) the severity of the disability; e) strength of the student's motivation; and (f) how willing they were to persevere under adverse conditions.

Even though there is limited scientific rigor in the transition literature, The National Council on Disability (2004) reported that there are still “pockets” of information, some evidence-based, that are worthy of discussion. For instance, Benz, Lindstrom, and Yovanoff (2000) reviewed the research on transition factors associated with secondary and postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities. Their search yielded six programmatic factors that resulted in better opportunities for students with disabilities:

- Participation in paid work experience in the community during the last two years of high school;
- Competence in: functional academic skills, community living skills, personal-social skills, vocational skills, and self-determination skills (e.g., self-advocacy, goal setting);
- Participation in transition planning;
- Participation in vocational education classes during the last two years of high school, especially classes that offer occupationally-specific instruction;
- Graduation from high school; and
- Absence of continuing instructional needs in functional academic, vocational, and
- Personal-social areas after leaving school. (Benz et al., 2000)

Hart et al., (2001) implemented and evaluated a model approach for creating access to college built around a student's strengths and preferences, involved family members, and used a collaborative interagency team (Student Support Team or SST) to create innovative strategies that support student access to inclusive college settings. The SST included college faculty, parents, students, and professionals, and its role was to develop individual services and supports for students who expressed an interest in pursuing a career in education. The SST met monthly to identify individual services and supports for participants, aged 17 - 22, with significant disabilities. Each SST developed a sample menu of individualized services and supports, some of which included academic coaching, transportation training, and career connections to employment, mentoring, technology, and social networks (Hart, et al., 2001). Positive student outcomes included completion of high school, postsecondary education, paid work experiences, expanded social networks, and increased sense of pride.

Research by Hasazi et al. (1999), Kohler (1993), and Benz et al. (2000) identified organizational factors associated with exemplary secondary and transition programs and better outcomes for students, including;

- The use of written interagency agreements between schools and adult agencies to structure the provision of collaborative transition services; and



- The establishment of key positions funded jointly by schools and adult agencies such as vocational rehabilitation to deliver direct services to students in transition.

### **Selected References:**

- Benz, M. R., Lindstrom, L., & Yovanoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children*, 66(4), 509-529.
- Hart, D., Zafft, C., & Zimbrich, K. (2001, Winter). Creating access to college for all students. *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 23, 19-31.
- Hasazi, S. B., Furney, K. S., & DeStefano, L. (1999). Implementing the IDEA transition mandates. *Exceptional Children*, 65(4), 555-566.
- Kohler, P. D. (1993). *Best practices in transition: substantiated or implied? Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 16, 107-121.
- National Council on Disability (2004). Improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Washington DC: Author.
- Skinner, M. E., & Lindstrom, B. D. (2003). Bridging the gap between high school and college: strategies for the successful transition of students with learning disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*, 47(3).

### **Goal 4: Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.**

#### **Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:**

##### **Teacher Induction**

Research on teacher induction was followed in the development of Georgia’s pilot teacher induction program. Research suggests that teacher quality is the largest single variable in student learning—explaining as much as 40 percent of the difference between students. In fact, several research studies confirm that placing a high-quality teacher in each classroom is one of the most important things schools can do to improve student achievement (Flouri and Buchanan (2004); Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1999; and Darling-Hammond, 1997), especially for students in low-income communities (Goldhaber and Anthony, 2004; McCaffrey, et. al., 2003; and Rivkin, et. al., 2002; and Hamushek and Kain, 2002). The more skilled a teacher, the higher the achievement of their students. It is well documented that large percentages of teachers without an induction program leave the teaching profession (Schlechty & Vance, 1983; CCTC & CDE, 1992; National Commission on Teaching and teaching in the greatest numbers (Schlechty & Vance, 1981; Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Similarly, state-initiated research studies have identified a rather stable set of program components that comprise effective teacher induction programs (Friske & Combs, 1986; Rossetto & Grosenick, 1987; Bartell, 1995; Olebe, Jackson, & Danielson, 1999). These components include:

- New teachers “mentored” by experienced support providers or coaches.
- Systematic observations of novice teachers by trained support providers.
- Teaching standards form the basis for induction.

- Collaborative coach and new teacher reflections on teaching practices.
- New teachers' ongoing collection of evidence of teaching practices.
- Integrated support and formative assessment systems that use performance assessments of new teachers' skills and abilities.

Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of teacher induction programs has shown that the key determinant of successful induction is a strong relationship between the novice teacher and an assigned and trained mentor teacher (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1992). Experienced teachers, specifically trained in cognitive coaching and standards-based teacher assessment, take on roles of support providers to new teachers. Coaches or support providers teach novice teachers reflective teaching skills and teach them how to become thoughtful practitioners. New teacher support providers encourage novice teachers to plan, teach, revise and apply what they have learned to future classroom lessons (Olebe, Jackson & Danielson, 1999). New teachers collect evidence about their teaching throughout the year and use it to self-assess their standards-based teaching practices (Wood, 2000).

Moir (2010) reported that the best teacher induction programs support novice teachers by tapping the expertise of veteran teachers, creating collegial groups that benefit all teachers and all students. Wood and Stanullis (2009) found that in successful induction programs, there is a comprehensive system of organized, educative mentor assistance, professional development, and formative assessment of novice teachers in their first through third years of teaching. Glazerman, et al (2010) concluded that the important features of successful teacher induction programs included carefully selected, trained full-time mentors, a curriculum of intensive and structured support for beginning teachers, including orientation, professional development opportunities, and weekly meetings with mentors; a focus on instruction, with opportunities for novice teachers to observe experienced teachers; formative assessment tools that permit evaluation of practice on an ongoing basis and require observation and constructive feedback; and outreach to district- and school-based administrators to educate them about program goals and to garner their systemic support for the program” (p. 37).

### **Selected References:**

- Bartell, C. A. (1995). Shaping teacher induction policy in California. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 22(4), 27-43.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education. (1999). *California formative assessment and support system for teachers*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). *Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Publication Series.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. (1999). Investing in teaching as a learning profession—policy problems and prospects. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes (Eds), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. New York: Josey-Bass, 376-412.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000 January). Teacher quality and student achievement.. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8 (1), 22-34.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Parker, M. B. (1992). *Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Flouri, E. and Buchanan, A. (2004). Early father's and mother's involvement and child's later educational outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 141-153.
- Friske, J. & Combs, M. (1986). Teacher induction programs: An Oklahoma perspective. *Action in Teacher Education*, 7(2), 67-74.

- Glazerman, S., Iseberg, E., Dolfen, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., Jacobus, M., & Ali, M. (2010), Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study, Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Science, US Department of Education.
- Goldhaber, D., and Anthony, E. (2004). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed?* Unpublished manuscript. Washington, D.C.
- Hanushek, E.A., Kain, J.F., and Rivkin, S.G. (2004). *Why public schools lose teachers.* Journal of Human Resources.
- McCaffrey, D.F., Lockwood, J.R., Koretz, D.M. and Hamilton, L.S. (2003). *Evaluating value-added models for teacher accountability.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Moir, E. (October (2009). Accelerating teacher effectiveness: Lessons learned from two decades of new teacher induction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(2), pp.14-21.
- Olebe, M., Jackson, A. & Danielson, C. (1999). Investing in beginning teachers—The California model. *Educational Leadership*, 65(8), 41-44.
- Rivkin, S.G., Hamushek, E.A., and Kain, J.F. (2002). *Teachers, schools, and academic achievement.* Dallas, TX: University of Texas-Dallas Texas Schools Project.
- Rossetto, C. & Grosenick, J. (1987). Effects of collaborative teacher education: Follow-up of graduates of a teacher induction program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 52-56.
- Schlechty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 468-87.
- Wood, A., L., & Stanulis, R.N. (2009). Quality teacher induction: Fourth wave induction programs, *The New Educator*, 5(1), pp. 1-23.
- Wood, A. (2000). Teaching portfolios: Tools for reflective teaching in inner city teacher induction. In D.J. McIntyre & D. Byrd (Eds.), *Research on effective models for teacher education: ATE teacher education yearbook VIII.* (pp. 111-126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

### **Student-Led IEPs (Project ASPIRE)**

In developing Project ASPIRE, research regarding student-led IEPs was incorporated. Research has shown that implementing some form of student-led IEPs with students with disabilities leads to positive outcomes regarding self-knowledge, self-determination, and self-advocacy (Konrad & Test, 2004; Mason et al., 2002). Whether teachers provide explicit instruction regarding the IEP process and writing portions of the document or allow students to develop their skills more implicitly, students benefit from an increased awareness of their disabilities and the various parts of the IEP process.

Konrad and Test (2004) studied the effectiveness of using an IEP template to teach middle school students how to write sections of their IEPs. The template was a workbook format developed by the researchers and included sections for writing the vision statement, present level of performance, annual goals (with objectives, measurement procedures, and criteria), services, and the least restrictive environment for meeting the annual goals. They found that by using a template as a first draft, middle school students became active participants and authors of their own IEPs. Konrad and Test also asserted that maintenance of the knowledge and skills learned through the use of IEP templates can easily be maintained by having students interact with their IEPs on a regular basis (daily or weekly) over an extended period of time.

Mason et al. (2002) were interested in how training students to prepare for and participate in their IEP meetings would impact their actual participation. They found that when teachers provided regular training over a period of up to six weeks, the students were able to lead all or most of the IEP meetings. One of the students had limited verbal ability but was still able to participate using head-nods and brief responses. They also

discovered a link between student experience and level of participation. Those students who had at least two years of experience in attending IEP meetings needed fewer teacher prompts and exhibited significantly more self-confidence. This presents the argument that early involvement promotes richer involvement in the future. Mason et al. noted that their research shows that "students with prior knowledge, experience, and training in being involved in the IEP process tended to be more aware of their disability, its impact on their school performance, and their need for self-advocacy" (p. 188). The participants in this study were also more aware of their accommodations and could provide interviewers with some knowledge of their disabilities. Another benefit of the training and experience was that the students were more likely to ask teachers for assistance and had increased confidence with public speaking activities.

These studies show that when students become part of the IEP process, they experience increased self-determination, self-awareness, and self-advocacy skills (Konrad & Test, 2004; Mason et al., 2002). They also provide a convincing argument for involving students in the IEP process as early as possible in their education (Mason et al.). This can lead to a sense of empowerment that assists these students with improving their future outcomes and becoming successful, productive citizens

### **Selected References:**

- Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2008). Students' opinions regarding their individualized education program involvement. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 31*, 69-76.
- Arndt, S. A., Konrad, M., & Test, D. W. (2006). Effects of the Self-Directed IEP on student participation in planning meetings. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*, 194-207.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press
- Eisenman, L., Chamberlin, M., & McGahee-Kovac, M. (2005). A teacher inquiry group on student-led IEPs: Starting small to make a big difference. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 28*, 195-206.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, 20 U.S.C. § 614 *et seq.* (2004) (reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990)
- Janiga, S. J., & Costenbader, V. (2002). The transition from high school to postsecondary education for students with learning disabilities: A survey of college service coordinators. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 462-468, 479.
- Mason, C., Field, S., & Sawilowsky, S. (2004). Implementation of self-determination activities and student participation in IEPs. *Exceptional Children, 70*, 441-451.

**Goal 5: Parents of preschool children within the targeted schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 will increase participation to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.**

### **Rationale for Scientific or Evidence-based Instructional/Behavioral Practices:**

Georgia's Parent Training Information (PTI) Center, Parent to Parent of Georgia, GaDOE'S Parent Mentor Program, and a coalition of Georgia parent and advocacy groups work to promote and support the development of Early Literacy Communities of Practice.

Performance measures 1.4a and 1.4b detail SPDG support of CAFÉs (Circle of Adults Focusing on Education). A CAFÉ is a method or a process of collaborative team problem solving on the local/community level to improve student achievement. The CAFÉ team typically includes at least three family members and several building-level decision makers. The team focuses on identifying and launching sustainable initiatives/activities to impact student success. CAFÉ dialogue meetings are approximately two hours.

During Year 2, SPDG staff supported the implementation of pilot CAFÉs in two schools/counties—Manchester High School (Meriwether County) and Rutland High School (Bibb County). A new CAFÉ was initiated during Year 3 in Elbert High School, Elbert County Schools. The goal of the three CAFÉ’s has been to create short-term and long-term solutions. These three CAFÉs continued their work during Year 4. Also in Year 4 a new concept “Mini-CAFÉs” was created. The Mini-CAFÉs were for schools that needed to address one need in less than six months rather than year long whole community projects

The work of the CAFÉs and the Early Literacy Communities of Practice are based on the importance of parental involvement in the early literacy learning of their child. Parent engagement is a powerful influence in student educational success and a strong predictor of a child’s achievement. Therefore, parent and family engagement activities are woven throughout all of the Georgia SPDG goals. A research review of some 300 studies by Kellaghan, et al., (1994), 49 studies by Edge and Davis (1994), 66 studies by Henderson & Berla (1994), and studies by Henderson and Mapp (2002) demonstrated that the family makes crucial contributions to student achievement. This is true across socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and educational backgrounds and for students of all ages (Mapp, 2004). These reviews also concluded that the earlier in a child’s educational process the parents and family are involved, the better the results. Redding, et al., (2004) showed that a critical mass of comprehensive and focused school-home activities can be generated in a relatively short period of time.

Coleman, et al., (2006) identified three necessary components for effectively involving parents in the schools: 1. Key information for parents about what their child is learning and how well they are learning; 2. Engagement activities for the parents to provide direct support for their child’s learning; and 3. Advocacy by parents so that their child receives necessary support. Epstein (2001) argued for the following parental roles to improve schools: volunteering, supporting their child’s learning at home, having meaningful roles for decision making in the schools, and collaboration with the community.

The content of the Communities of Practice is also based on the research synthesis of the National Early Literacy Panel (2008) and a secondary research synthesis conducted by Dunst, Trivett, and Hamby (2010) of the work of the National Early Literacy Council, in which 234 studies were identified as scientifically based, having a predictive relation between a skill measured during preschool and a conventional literacy measured at some later point in time.

The work of Snow, Burns and Griffin in the area of preventing reading difficulties in young children is also an example of research-based content. In addition, the work from the Center for Early Literacy Learning is held in high regards for their strong adherence to scientifically based reading practices. The work of the National Early Literacy Research Panel and the National Early Literacy Panel for Young Children who are English Language Learners – out of the National Center for Applied Linguistics (Diane August and colleagues) is also being utilized in developing the content for the Communities of Practice.

Senechal and Young (2008) focused on intervention studies that tested whether parent-child reading activities enhances children's reading acquisition. The combined results for the 16 intervention studies, representing 1,340 families, were clear: Parent involvement has a positive effect on children's reading acquisition. Further analyses revealed that interventions in which parents tutored their children using specific literacy activities produced larger effects than those in which parents listened to their children read books.

### **Selected References:**

- Burns, M.S., Griffin, P., & Snow, C.E. (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promote children's reading success*. Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Trivette, C.M., Dunst, C.J., Hamby, D.W. (2010). Influences of family systems intervention practices on parent-child interactions and child development. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 30, 3-19
- Epstein, A. S. (September, 2003). How planning and reflection develop young children's thinking skills. *Young Children on the Web*.
- Henderson, A.T., & Berla, N. (Eds). (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. National Committee for Citizens in Education: Washington, DC.
- Henderson, A., and Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX; Southwest Educational Laboratory.
- Kellaghan, T.K., Sloane, B., and Alvarez, & Bloom, B.S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., National Early Literacy Panel. (2006, March). *Findings from the National Early Literacy Panel: Providing a focus for early language and literacy development*. Presentation.
- Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (Eds.). (2001). Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics. Retrieved March 20, 2008, from the National Academies Press Web site: [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=9822](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=9822)
- Kroesbergen, E. H., & Van Luit, J. E. H. (2003). Mathematics interventions for children with special educational needs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(2), 97-114.
- Mapp, K. (2004). *Family engagement*. In F.P. Schargel and J. Simink (Eds.), *Helping students graduate: A strategic approach to dropout prevention* (pp. 99-113). Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1996). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. (2002). *Early childhood mathematics: Promoting good beginnings*. Washington, DC:
- National Early Literacy Council National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy. Available at <http://www.nifl.gov/earlychildhood/NELP/NELPreport.html>
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching students to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Reports of the subgroups. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications>. Research on DIBELS website: <http://www.researchondibels.com>.

Senechal, M. & Young, L. (December 2008). The effect of family literacy interventions on children's acquisition of reading from kindergarten to grade 3: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 80-907.

**During Year 4, the following Goal 1-4 trainings/professional development sessions were carried out:**

GraduateFIRST Trainings (8 Trainings – 450 Participants)  
GraduateFIRST – Math (12 Trainings – 308 Participants)  
ASPIRE Student Led IEPs (10 Trainings – 87 Participants)  
Transition Planning (7 Trainings – 297 Participants)  
Induction (17 Trainings – 215 Participants)  
Parent Engagement (28 Trainings - 3,723 Participants)

**Total – 82 Trainings and 5,080 Participants**

**Federal Performance Measure 1.1:**

**Number of Total Persons Trained (Goals 1-5): 5,080**

**Number and Percent of Participants Receiving Scientifically Based Instructional Practices: 4,930/5,080 = 97.1%**

**Federal Performance Measure 2.1:**

**Total Goals 1-5 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 80**

**Number and Percentage of Professional Development/Training Activities Based on Scientific or Evidence-Based Practices: 80/82 – 97.6%**

**1-5c – Alignment of Professional Development with State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) – Goals 1-5 (Federal Performance Measure 1.2)**

Following is a summary showing the alignment of the Georgia's five SPDG goals to the state's SPP/APR.

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Indicator 4A/b:** Rates of suspension and expulsion: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Indicator 4A/b:** Rates of suspension and expulsion: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Indicator 7:** Increase the percentage of young children with disabilities who show improved positive social/emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors. Goals 1, 2, and 5.

**Indicator 8:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment; transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals; and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority: SPDG Goals 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school: SPDG Goal 4

**Total Goals 1-5 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 80**

**Number and Percentage Aligned with Georgia SPP Indicators: 80/80 – 100%**

#### **1-5d – Professional Development Sustained by On-Going and Comprehensive Practices - Goals 1-5 (Federal Performance Measure 2.2)**

##### **Follow-up for Sustainability:**

Following is a summary of follow-up activities to sustain trainings within Goals 1-4 during Year 4:

##### **Math:**

- During Year 4, a two-part math training series was held in four locations in Georgia (i.e., the first part was Algebra – Mathematics 1 and 2 and the second part: Geometry and Statistics – Mathematics 1 and 2). A follow-up webinar was held in March 2011 to prepare teachers for review of the End of Course Test (EOCT) and the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHS GT). In essence, the math training was layered to build on previous skills.
- Collaboration Coaches and Team Leaders provided ongoing support/technical assistance in the implementation of scientifically based math interventions/content
- In addition, scientifically based math trainings were also shared in monthly School Team and monthly Team Leader meetings.

##### **Student Led IEPs:**

- Five ASPIRE trainings on student-led IEPs were followed up with 4-hour student-led trainings.
- Follow-up technical assistance from a consultant at student-led IEP meetings in participating schools.

##### **Transition Planning:**

- Training provided at regional transition council meetings/workgroups was followed up with technical assistance from a consultant.
- Five transition plan trainings were followed up by a consultant who reviewed/evaluated the quality of transition IEPs.



- GaDOE compliance staff reviews were also held with compliance determination.

**Induction:**

- Induction Coach trainings were followed up with continuing training, webinars, and other technical assistance from the GaDOE.
- Beginning teacher trainings were followed up with weekly Induction Coach sessions with observations and feedback.

**Parent Engagement:**

- Some of the family engagement/CAFÉ trainings were followed up with Elluminate webinars, as well as coaching and technical assistance from the Family Outreach Coordinator and local Parent Mentors.
- There were a number of family engagement large group presentations that did not have systemic, planned follow-up. Telephone and email assistance was, however, occasionally provided.

**Total Goals 1-5 SPDG Professional Development/Training Activities: 80**  
**Number and Percent with Systematic Follow-up for Sustainability: 65/80 = 81.3%**



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 1:** Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.

**Objective 1.1:** The GaDOE will enhance its infrastructure providing coordinated resources for Cohort schools, thereby facilitating planning and implementation in all Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools.

**Objective 1.2:** The math, reading specialists and other staff within the Cohort schools will increase their awareness and skills in providing scientifically- based researched (SBR) math and reading strategies for students with disabilities in the GPI by attending training with periodic updates during the year.

**Objective 1.3:** The reading and math skills of secondary students with disabilities will attain statistical significance above their baseline because of increased implementation and use of SBR reading (English/Language Arts), particularly comprehension, and math strategies, monitoring of student achievement and use of increasingly more intense interventions within the Georgia Pyramid of Interventions.

**Goal 2:** The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of school will be reduced by 50% through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavior interventions.

**Objective 2.1:** Effective dropout prevention programs/strategies will be implemented within participating Cohort schools.

1/2.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of School Team Leaders and Team members reporting positive impact of implementation of scientifically	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

based reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention programs, within their Action Plans.			/	100			89.2 – Cohort 1 and 2 84.7– Cohort 3
---	--	--	---	-----	--	--	---

1/2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Collaboration Coaches reporting that Planet Literacy training provided them skills to use routinely in helping schools improve adolescent literacy (4 out of 5 on a 5-point rating scale).	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		7	7/11	62.6

1/2.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort participants receiving LRE/Co-Teaching Training who reported that the ongoing support received following training was very helpful in implementing school and classroom interventions.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/				NA for Year 4

1/2.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Average rating of participants receiving math training reporting that training content met the training goals.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			3.40/4.00	3.4 Rating

1/2.e Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of special and general education teachers in the Cohort schools who report that the on-going math support re-	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

ceived from their SPDG Collaboration Coaches and/or School Team Leader was helpful or very helpful in assisting them to implement scientifically based reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention strategies for students with disabilities.			/	80		/	90.9 – Cohort 1 and 2 89.6 – Cohort 3
--	--	--	---	----	--	---	--

1/2.f Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 1 high schools reporting increased graduation with regular diplomas for students with disabilities.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	60		11/12 – All 11/12 - SWD	91.7 91.7

See narrative below for ranges.

1/2.g Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 2 high schools reporting increased graduation with regular diplomas for students with disabilities.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	60		42/48 – All 29/48 - SWD	87.5 60.4

1/2.h Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 1 high schools reporting increased retention of students with and without disabilities, thereby reducing the dropout rate.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	60		10/12 - All 10/12 - SWD	83.3 83.3

See narrative below for ranges.

1/2.i Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 2 high schools reporting increased retention of students with and without disabilities, thereby reducing the dropout rate.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	60		33/48 – All 28/48 - SWD	68.8% 58.3%

1/2.j Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 1 schools reporting reduced absences of more than 15 days (increased attendance) by students with disabilities.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	80		9/16 - Middle 6/12 - High	56.3 50.0

See narrative below for middle and high school breakdown and ranges.

1/2.k Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data*					
Percentage of Cohort 2 schools reporting reduced absences of more than 15 days (increased attendance) by students with disabilities.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	80		8/13 - Middle 19/48 - High	61.5 39.6

1/2.l Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 1 schools reporting an increased percentage of students within Cohort schools who meet or exceeded	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in English/Language Arts.			/	60		12/16- Middle 7/12 – High	75.0 58.3
---	--	--	---	----	--	------------------------------	--------------

1/2.m Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 2 schools reporting an increased percentage of students within Cohort schools who meet or exceeded standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in English/Language Arts.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	60		9/13 - Middle 20/48 – High	69.2 41.7

1/2.n Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 1 schools reporting an increased percentage of students who meet or exceeded standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in math.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	80		11/16 - Middle 7/12 – High	68.5 58.3

2/3.o Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Cohort 2 schools reporting an increased percentage of students who meet or exceeded standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education) in math.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		80		12/13 - Middle 28/48 - High

1/2.p Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 1 schools with no in-school and no out-of school suspensions.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			837	837/1,093

1/2.q Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools with no in-school and no out-of school suspensions.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			1,810	1,810/2,472

See narrative below for middle and high school breakdown and ranges.

1/2.r Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students with disabilities in grades 5-12 within Cohort 3 schools with no in-school and no out-of school suspensions.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			1,565	1,565/2,133

1/2.s Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Average number of days absent by students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 1 schools.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/				3.2 Days

1/2.t Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Average number of days absent by students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/				2.9 Days

1/2.u Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Average number of days absent by students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 3 schools.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/				3.0 Days

1/2.v Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 1 schools with no course failures.	PROGRAM PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		543	543/1,093	49.7

\* - In-school suspensions; \*\* - Out-of-school suspensions

1/2.w Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		



Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools with no course failures.	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/		1,546	1,546/2,472	62.5

<b>1/2.x Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
Percentage of students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 3 schools with no course failures.	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/		1,226	1,226/2,133	57.5

<b>1/2.y Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percentage of SPDG projects that successfully replicate the use of scientifically based or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools. (Long-Term) (Federal Performance Measure 4.1).	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/				See Narrative Below

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**1/2.a – Implementation of Scientifically Based Reading, Math, and/or Dropout Prevention Programs/Strategies**

Action plans have been developed by each of the 142 participating middle and high schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 for their selected Priority Improvement Areas, as summarized in Tables 3, 4, and 5 in this Year 4 Annual Report Attachment. GLRS Collaboration Coaches supported the implementation of these action plans within Cohort 1 through on-site technical assistance and training within the Cohort schools during Years 1 and 2. The National Dropout Prevention Center and the GaDOE staff also provided back-up assistance to the Collaboration Coaches and the school-level teams. During Year 3, the School Dropout Prevention Team Leaders have provided support to their school teams. Backup support has also been provided by the GLRS Collaboration Coaches and the GaDOE. Following are systems and procedures utilized within the SPDG-supported Graduate/FIRST project to ensure that Action Plans are implemented with fidelity:

- Monthly meetings by the GaDOE and the Collaboration Coaches to monitor implementation and plan efforts to ensure consistent implementation across the state in the Cohort 1, 2, and 3 middle and high schools.
- Consistent use across the state of forms and procedures contained in a GraduateFirst Implementation Manual.

- Monthly meetings between the Collaboration Coaches and school team leaders to discuss the status of Action Plan implementation, implementation challenges and successes, as well as technical assistance, training needs of the school teams. These monthly meetings also covered discussions of data gathering for SPDG probes, data analysis, follow-up technical assistance to previous trainings such as school and student engagement, math strategies, archived Elluminate sessions, and GraduateFIRST Progress Assessment.
- Regularly-scheduled meetings by the school team leaders with school teams to help guide Action Plan implementation, as well as to provide training, assistance, and problem solving of specific implementation issues.
- Monthly logs utilized by the Collaboration Coaches to document support and assistance provided to school team leaders and school teams. Monthly reports of coach activities are prepared by the SPDG third party evaluators for review by the GaDOE.
- Team leader meeting minutes and Collaboration Coach log data/information summarized monthly by the SPDG third party evaluators for review by the GaDOE.
- On-going progress monitoring of a sample of students with a GraduateFIRST Assessment Tool in attendance, in-school suspension, and course failures—see performance measures 1/2.p-2/2x.
- Other assessment tools measuring student performance including walk through observations, surveys, benchmarks, logs, charts, and student portfolios.
- Annual outcome assessment of baseline vs. current year data on the data probes discussed earlier—see performance measures 1/2f-1/2o.
- End-of-year survey to gather information regarding Action Plan implementation and perceived benefits of support from Collaboration Coaches and school-based team leaders—see performance measure 1/2e.

The GraduateFIRST website was revised and launched during the early part of Year 4 to be a source of ongoing information, training, and sharing of Action Plan implementation issues and successes.

In the Year 4 end-of-year survey, (described in performance measure 1/2e below), 90.6% of the Cohort 1 and 2 and 79.5% of Cohort 3 respondents reported that scientifically based reading, math, and/or other dropout prevention strategies/programs were being implemented in their schools to increase graduation rates. Cohort 1, 2, and 3 school team respondents indicated that these dropout prevention strategies are being implemented with fidelity (93.1% of Cohort 1 and 2 and 93.4% of Cohort 3). Of the total school team respondents in Cohorts 1 and 2, 89.2% of Cohorts 1 and 2 and 84.7% of Cohort 3 reported that there were positive outcomes in their school as a result of participation in the dropout prevention program and the assistance received.

The following are examples of feedback received from Cohort 1 and 2 school team respondents regarding the impact of the dropout prevention strategies/programs implemented during the school year:

- Teachers and students are more aware of strategies.
- Attendance in school has increased, joining after school activities.
- There are marked improvement with our target students' grades and attendance.
- Student climate has improved.
- More students ask for additional help. They sometimes come before school and stay after school.
- There are fewer numbers of failures at the end of the quarter.

- Student connectedness has increased.
- We are seeing gains specifically related to course passing (particularly with the 9th grade academy students).
- We are seeing some gains in benchmark and other assessments.
- Relationships are being built and students are working more diligently in school. They are actively pursuing their diploma.
- The target group is aware that someone is interested in whether they are attending school or not.
- We have focused on our 9th and 10th grade population. Grades are improving.
- There is a tremendous drop in discipline incidents, which increased time in class.
- Inclusion math classes are using more student performance tasks.
- Graduation talks are the norm for our students and parents now.
- The students who are specifically targeted to receive mentors have definitely been more positive about attending school.
- Math scores on interim assessments have improved.
- Student attendance has improved.
- The feedback on student engagement survey has been positive.
- Several students who were tracked initially have been doing extremely well...earning credits and passing all courses as well as improving attendance.
- Students have shown an increase in ability level, especially those that participate on a regular basis in the after school program.
- The number of classes failed at the 18-week mark is less than the 9-week mark,.
- There have been less failures in math, overall.
- Students are achieving at a higher level due to our interventions.
- In addition to skill gains, motivation and engagement have also improved.
- Many fewer of the GraduationFirst students are failing in their Math and ELA classes....they are extremely frustrated with the difficulty of the math curriculum, in particular.
- We have a larger rate of 9th grade students passing Integrated Algebra.
- All the students who were being helped last year are still in school.
- Students are attending consistently and working hard to remain on track for graduation.

Given that the Cohort 3 schools were just beginning their implementation stage this year, positive outcomes were more limited, but following are some examples of school team responses.

- Students are more confident about reading and it shows in other classes.
- Students are passing graduation tests.
- Students feel a connection with the school and are building relationships with teachers and administrators.
- Students are more actively engaged in the classroom.
- Teachers are more focused on students as individual learners with differing needs.
- Students are more focused and successful.
- We have created a club for students in danger of dropping out. This club provides a sense of membership and belonging within the school.

- Teachers are focusing more on differentiation as needed for the different learners in their classes.
- RTI teams are meeting regularly to discuss and develop plans that address individual needs and the increased parent contact is occurring.
- We have re-vamped and created a school wide discipline plan, which has changed the culture of the school tremendously as well as the Self Determination Program.
- We have seen positive changes in behavior and students becoming more involved in their own education.
- Students are better informed.
- None of our students are failing more than one class, and attendance has improved.
- We have had reduced course failures and progress reports for this nine weeks.
- Students have greatly improved, along with self-confidence.
- We have had a large number come back to school recently.
- Students are taking advantage of the after school math and credit recovery assistance.
- Students have better relationships with adults/mentors in school.

### **1/2.b – Participant Feedback from Planet Literacy**

During Year 4, the Struggling Reader Course was discontinued and replaced by Planet Literacy training which was held in August 25, 2010. Planet Literacy training is based on strategies to get students actively engaged in vocabulary and other literacy/reading components. The training contains ten scripted modules with an accompanying PowerPoint for re-delivery. Training participants indicated that the Planet Literacy strategies are straight forward, discrete, and easily implemented by teachers and across the curriculum.

Participant feedback indicated that after participating in the training, 66.6% reported having skills to use routinely to support the schools in improving adolescent literacy (4 out of a 5-point rating scale). All (100%) of the Collaboration Coaches receiving this training rated the overall content of the Planet Literacy training as excellent (5 out of a 5-point rating scale). Throughout Year 4, the GLRS Collaboration Coaches utilized this training in follow-up activities. Following are examples of this follow-up:

- Sharing of strategies learned with local GraduateFIRST team leaders.
- Implementing follow-up strategies in the classroom.
- Re-delivery of Planet Literacy to several GraduateFIRST schools with Specialists/Literacy Coaches helping to monitor implementation.

Examples:

#### **Cohort 1:**

- Madison County Middle School—partial faculty of approximately 50 people.

#### **Cohort 2:**

- Burney Harris Lyons Middle School—whole faculty of approximately 60 people,
- Clark Middle School—whole faculty of approximately 60 people; and
- Cedar Shoals High School—whole faculty of approximately 90 people
- Sharing of PowerPoint training materials in the Cohort schools.
- Follow-up school-wide (cross-curricular) strategies.

- Continued use of partner share strategies such as the four-fold, taboo, frayer, and a version of the back-to-back partner share strategy in other trainings.
- Initiation of a follow-up reading project with the GNETS center in the South Central GLRS, using Planet Literacy with presentations to the 6-12 grade teachers (all content areas) in bi-weekly one-hour modules regarding the Planet Literacy strategies. Feedback from participants was positive (i.e., strategies that are easy to take back to the classroom and immediately use). In each of the bi-weekly sessions, the teachers shared a strategy implemented since the last session.

### **1/2.c – Satisfaction with On-going Support in Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)/Co-Teaching**

During Year 3, support in LRE was provided by the SPDG to Cohort 1 (Henry County and Gwinnett County) and Cohort 2 systems (Marietta City and Elbert County). LRE coaches worked with school leadership teams to assist them in enhancing their school's use of co-teaching as a strategy to promote appropriate LRE services to students with disabilities. Leadership teams used two researched-based strategies, coaching and professional learning communities, to promote effective use of co-teaching as a strategy to support students with disabilities in the general classroom.

During Year 4, the GaDOE assumed the responsibility for training and support in the area of LRE as a broader initiative because during state monitoring, 19 school districts did not meet the SPP/APR Indicator 9 – Increase the percentage of students with disabilities who receive their instruction in the general education setting with appropriate supports and accommodations.

### **1/2d – Rating by Participants receiving Math Training**

Thirty-one Cohort 2 and 23 Cohort 3 schools selected math as their Priority Area for interventions during Year 4. Therefore, based on this need, a major Year 4 training emphasis was on math training. Twelve face-to-face math trainings were provided for 328 school personnel from the Cohort 1, 2, and 3 schools. Eight of the math trainings were a two-part training series held in four regional locations in Georgia (i.e., the first part - Algebra – Mathematics 1 and 2 and the second part: Geometry and Statistics – Mathematics 1 and 2). Embedded in these sessions were suggestions on how to set up Mathematics Support Classes. A follow-up webinar is planned for later in the spring to prepare teachers for review of the EOCT and the GAHSGT (Georgia High School Graduation Test). In addition, two “Math in the Fast Lane” sessions were provided for Cohort 3 general and special high school math teachers in February 2010 utilizing research-based strategies aimed at struggling students. Table 17 in the Annual Performance Report includes a listing of all math trainings held during Year 4 of the SPDG.

Participant evaluations were available for five of the math trainings. Participants were asked whether the training goals were met in specific content areas (8 in e trainings and 7 in two trainings). On a scale 4-point rating scale, an average rating of 3.40 was given by training participants across the five trainings—ranging from 2.98 to 3.72.

### **1/2.e – Satisfaction with Support Received from School Team Leaders and Collaboration Coaches**

The GLRS Collaboration Coaches and school team leaders are critical components in the Georgia SPDG improvement efforts. A part-time Collaboration Coach was assigned to each of the Cohort 1 participating schools during Year 1 to provide ongoing assistance to the Cohort 1 participating schools as they implemented activities/initiatives related to their Priority Improvement Areas. In the replication phase to Cohort 2 (beginning

Year 3) and Cohort 3 (beginning Year 4), the Collaboration Coaches began to work closely with the school team leaders meeting with them monthly and providing ongoing support, training, and technical assistance. Likewise, the school team leaders met monthly with their school teams to provide assistance and monitor the implementation of Action Plans and to provide assistance to their teams.

An end-of the year electronic survey was administered in February-March 2011 to all of the Cohort 1, 2, and 3 team leaders and school team members. Response rates were 41.9% for Cohort 1 and 2 and 57.3% for Cohort 3. Following is the feedback received for Cohort 1, Cohort 2, and Cohort 3 school team respondents. This data needs to be considered in light of a low response rate for Cohorts 1 and 2. Getting a desired 60+% survey return rate is more difficult with increasing E-mail filters in the schools.

### **Cohort 1 and 2:**

#### **Type of Training Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:**

Coaching – Average of 77.9%

Training – Average of 52.6%

Observation – Average of 37.0%

An additional 34 respondents (22.1%) reported other types of assistance including:

- Facilitation of group meetings.
- Collaboration Coach and team leader have made an exhaustive effort to give me guidance in the various questions that arise while parenting/schooling a student with disabilities.
- Provided various resources and support.
- Review of student data.
- Provided ideas for GHS/GT preparation and motivation.
- Planning activities to encourage/reward successes.
- Site visits for support.
- Collaboration and goal setting.
- Information and clarification as well as strategies and ideas.
- Sharing example of effective attendance incentives.
- Meeting with our school team to discuss our Action Plan.
- Team leader attends math curriculum meetings to facilitate development of lesson plans
- The collaboration coach and I pull and analyze data together and discuss the progress of the implementation of strategies.
- Provides updates from DOE and shares best practices from other schools involved with GraduateFIRST project.
- Consultation assistance.
- Answering questions, attends local GraduateFirst meetings.
- Meetings on a regular basis to review and discuss students and practices.
- Participates in discussions about different strategies/modification of strategies.

- Helps to implement ideas.
- Mentors students daily and at our Saturday School.
- Continues to be a motivator for our school team.
- Meetings updates on training opportunities and assistance when needed.

### **Cohort 3:**

#### **Type of Training Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:**

Coaching – Average of 77.9%

Training – Average of 71.7%

Observation – Average of 29.7%

An additional 22 respondents (15.2%) reported other types of assistance including on-site meeting/technical assistance and telephone/email support including:

- Exchange of strategies and ideas.
- General assistance with data collection and focused assistance with our student survey and action plans.
- Emailed information.
- Attended our mentoring "meet and greet" in addition to her assigned tasks/responsibilities
- Assisted us with revising the Self Determination Curriculum to fit our school, and stayed until after 5 on a Friday helping us put the notebooks together.
- Assisted me with trying to find data since our situation is different at the alternative school.
- Researched answers to questions for me regarding data.
- Collaboration Coach helped develop the program and assisted through every step of the process for the program with the GraduateFIRST team.
- Provides resources for our school and informs us of various professional development available to help our school.
- Offers advice.
- Offers helpful and effective strategies for helping struggling students.
- Provides resources for our school and informs us of various professional development available to help our school.
- Provides assistance with entering data for this project; schedules meetings to provide adequate time to enter data, and shares materials and alternative lessons/tips and tricks.

Following is a summary of the satisfaction feedback received from Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 respondents regarding the assistance and support received by the Dropout Prevention Team Leaders and/or the GLRS Collaboration Coach:

### **Cohort 1 and 2:**

#### **Satisfaction with Assistance Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:**

Very Helpful – Average of 40.9 %

Helpful – Average of 50.0%

Uncertain – Average of 5.8%

Not Helpful –Average of 1.3%

Definitely Not Helpful – Average of 1.9%%

### **Cohort 3:**

#### **Satisfaction with Assistance Received from the Dropout Prevention Team Leader and/or the Collaboration Coach:**

Very Helpful – Average of 51.0%

Helpful – Average of 38.6%

Uncertain – Average of 9.0%

Not Helpful –Average of 1.4%

Definitely Not Helpful – Average of 0%

#### **1/2.f – Graduation with a Regular Diploma by Students with and without Disabilities in Cohort I Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

The State requirements for graduation with a regular diploma are to pass the Georgia High School Graduation Test and obtain the following credits as outlined in Georgia Rule 160-4-2-.48 as a) four credits in English/language arts, b) four credits in mathematics, c) four credits in science, d) three credits in social studies, e) three credits in CTAE and/or modern language/Latin and/or fine arts, f) one credit in health and physical education, and g) four electives which totals 23 credits. This requirement is the same for students with and without disabilities.

Table 6 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of changes in graduation rates for all students from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 12 Cohort I participating high schools. Eleven Cohort I high schools reported an average graduation rate of 75.8%.during 2009-2010. The increased graduation percent change from baseline to 2009-2010 for all students, ranged from 2.3% in North Gwinett High School to +24.9% change in Lucey Laney High School. Two of the Cohort I high schools reported a decreased graduation rate percent change for all students from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from -2.2% change in Cook County High School to -6.0% in Douglass High School. The participating Cohort I schools made a +10.2% average percentage point gain in the graduation of all students from baseline to 2009-2010.

For students with disabilities, Cohort 1 high schools reported an average graduation rate of 34.0% during 2009-2010. Eleven Cohort 1 high schools reported an increased graduation percent change for students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010, ranged from +2.2% change in Coffee High School to +23.1% change in Manchester High School. Two of the Cohort 1 high schools reported a decreased graduation rate percent change for students with disabilities from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from -3.9% change in Murray County High School to -4.8% in



Douglass High School. The participating Cohort 1 schools made a +9.8% average percentage point gain in the graduation of students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 1 high schools were in the second year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-11 data (third year of implementation) that will reflect the impact during Year 4 of the SPDG will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

### **1/2.g – Graduation with a Regular Diploma by Students with and without Disabilities in Cohort 2 Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

Table 7 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of changes in graduation rates for all students from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 48 participating Cohort 2 high schools. The reporting Cohort 2 high schools reported an average of 77.6% graduation rate in 2009-2010. The increased graduation percent change from baseline to 2009-2010 for all students within 42 Cohort 2 high schools ranged from +0.3% change at Hart County High School to +41.6% change in Marietta High School. Five Cohort high schools reported a decreased graduation rate percent change for all students from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.3% change in Claxton High School to -4.9% in Chattahoochee County High School. One high school was a new school and did not have data to report. The participating Cohort 2 schools made a +9.5% average percentage point gain in the graduation of all students from baseline to 2009-2010.

For students with disabilities, the reporting Cohort 2 schools had an average graduation rate of 38.5%. A total of 29 of the 48 Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased graduation percent change for students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010 ranging from +1.4% change in Clark Central High School to +43.1% change in Hardaway High School. Sixteen of the 49 Cohort 2 high schools reported a decreased graduation rate percent change for all students from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -1.0% change in West Laurens High School to -17.8% in Dougherty Comprehensive High School. One school was a new and did not report data. One school had too few students with disabilities to report, and one participating Cohort 2 high school did not report data. The participating Cohort 2 schools made an overall +8.8% average percentage point gain in the graduation of students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010.

The Cohort 2 high schools were in the first year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data that will reflect the impact during Year 4 (second year of implementation) will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

### **1/2.h – Decreased Dropout Rate in Cohort 1 High Schools for Students with and without Disabilities – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

Table 8 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of dropout rate changes for all students from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 12 Cohort 1 participating high schools. The Cohort 1 high schools reported an average of 4.1% dropout rate during 2009-2010. As can be seen by this data, two Cohort 1 high schools reported an increased dropout rate change for all students from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.8% change in Rutland High School to +2.5% change in Douglass High

School. Ten Cohort 1 high schools reported a decreased dropout rate (increased retention) for all students from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.1% in Coffee High School to -8.2% % in Lucey Laney High School. The participating Cohort 1 schools made a -2.2% average percentage point reduction in the dropout rate of all students from baseline to 2009-2010.

For students with disabilities, the 12 Cohort 1 high schools reported an average of 5.7% in the dropout rate during 2009-2010. An increased dropout rate change from baseline to 2009-2010 within three Cohort 1 high schools ranged from 0.6% change in North Gwinett High School High School to +2.1% change in Douglass High School. Nine Cohort 1 high schools reported a decreased dropout percent change (increased retention) for students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010 ranging from -0.3% change in Henry County High School to -7.5% change in Murray High School. The participating Cohort 1 schools made an overall -2.5% average percentage point reduction in the dropout rate of students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 1 high schools were in the second year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-11 data (third year of implementation) that will reflect the impact during Year 4 of the SPDG will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

#### **1/2.i – Decreased Dropout Rate in Cohort 2 High Schools for Students with and without Disabilities – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

Table 9 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of dropout rate changes for all students from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 48 Cohort 2 participating high schools. The Cohort 2 high schools reported an overall average dropout rate of 3.5% for all students in 2009-2010. Fifteen Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased dropout rate change from baseline to 2009-2010 ranging from +0.1% change in Dade County High School to +4.4% change in North Clayton High School. Thirty-three Cohort 2 schools reported a decreased dropout rate (increased retention) from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.2% change in Gilmer County High School to -50.0% change in East Hall High School. The participating Cohort 2 schools made an overall -1.9% average percentage point reduction in the dropout rate of all students from baseline to 2009-2010.

For students with disabilities, Cohort 2 high schools reported an overall average dropout rate of 5.2% in 2009-2010. Nineteen Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased average dropout rate change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.2% % change in Kendrick High School to +8.0% change in Wilkinson High School. Twenty-eight Cohort 2 high schools reported a decreased dropout percent change for students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.2% change in Beckmar High School to -8.9% change in Charlton High School. East Hall High School did not report any percent change from baseline to 2009-2010. The participating Cohort 2 schools made an overall -0.9% average percentage point reduction in the dropout rate of students with disabilities from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 2 high schools were in the first year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data that will reflect the impact during Year 4 (second year of implementation) will not available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

## **1/2.j – Attendance Rates (More Than 15 Days absent) by Students with Disabilities in Cohort I Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2008-09**

### **Middle Schools:**

Table 10 in the Year 3 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of attendance rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 16 Cohort I participating middle schools. Cohort I middle schools reported an overall average percentage for absentees over 15 days of 13.5% during 2009-2010.

Within the Cohort I middle schools with fewer absentees, percentage changes ranged from -0.6% change in Lewis-Frazier Middle School to -22.6% change in Harper-Archer Middle School. Nine Cohort I middle schools reported a decreased attendance rate change from baseline to 2009-2010 (increased absentees for more than 15 days) from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +1.1% in Manchester Middle School to +11.9% change in Midway Middle School. The participating Cohort I middle schools made an overall -2.9% average percentage point reduction in the students with an absenteeism rate of over 15 days from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 10 also provides a summary of attendance rate changes for students with disabilities from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 12 Cohort I participating high schools. The Cohort I high schools had an overall average percentage for absentees over 15 days of 28.3% during 2009-2010.

Six Cohort I high schools reported an overall increased attendance from baseline to 2009-2010 of 28.0%, with percent changes in absences of 15+ days from baseline to 2009-2010 ranging from a -4.9% reduction of absences over 15 days in Bainbridge High School to -15.9% change in Henry County High School. Six Cohort I high schools reported a decreased attendance rate (increased absentees for more than 15 days) from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +1.5% change in Coffee High School to +9.1% change in Douglass High School. The participating Cohort I high schools made an overall -1.6% average percentage point reduction in the students with an absenteeism rate of over 15 days from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort I middle and high schools were in the second year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-11 data (third year of implementation) that will reflect the impact during Year 4 of the SPDG will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

## **1/2.k – Attendance Rates (More Than 15 Days absent) by Students with Disabilities in Cohort 2 Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2008-09.**

### **Middle Schools:**

Table 11 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of attendance rate changes from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 13 participating middle schools. Cohort 2 middle schools reported an overall average percentage for absentees over 15 days of 9.0% during 2009-2010.

As can be seen by Table 11, six Cohort 2 middle schools reported an increased attendance rate (fewer absentees for more than 15 days) change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.1% reduction change in Fannin Middle School to -10.6% reduction change in Fort Middle School. Seven of the 13 Cohort 2 middle schools reported increased absences of more than 15 days from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from +0.1% change in Richards Middle School to +13.9% change in Twiggs County Middle School. The participating Cohort 2 middle schools made a -0.2% average percentage point reduction in the students with an absenteeism rate of over 15 days from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 11 also provides a summary of attendance rate changes for students with disabilities from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 48 Cohort 2 participating high schools. Cohort 2 high schools reported an overall average percentage for absentees over 15 days of 27.5% during 2009-2010.

Twenty Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased attendance rate (fewer absentees for more than 15 days) change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.1% reduction change in Hart County High School to -11.3% reduction change in Upson-Lee High School. Twenty-eight Cohort 2 high schools reported decreased attendance rates (increased absences of more than 15 days) from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.8% change in Elbert County Comprehensive High Schools to +15.6% change in Hardaway High School. The participating Cohort 2 high schools made an overall +2.0% average percentage point gain in the students with an absenteeism rate of over 15 days from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 2 high schools were in the first year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data that will reflect the impact during Year 4 (second year of implementation) will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

To measure statewide academic success and progress toward narrowing the achievement and graduation gaps, the achievement levels of students with disabilities are assessed by the percent of students with disabilities who meet or exceed standards (established by the Georgia Board of Education). The performance measures 1/2 o and 1/1p report on the percentage gain of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding these standards from baseline to 2008-2009. Baseline is reported as the average score during 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08.

## **1/2.l – Standards in Reading/English/Language Arts in Cohort 1 Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

### **Middle Schools:**

Table 12 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 16 Cohort 1 participating middle schools. The participating Cohort 1 middle schools made an average of 56.0% in reading/language arts passage during 2009-2010.

Table 12 shows that twelve participating middle schools had a increased percentage gain from baseline to 2009-2010 ranged from +1.5% change in Rutland Middle School to +24.7% change in Bagley Middle School. Four Cohort 1 middle schools reported a decreased English/Language Arts achievement rate change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -4.7% in Double Churches Middle School to -17.5% in Hornsby Middle School. The participating Cohort 1 middle schools made an overall +3.9% average percentage point gain English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 12 also provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement percent changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 12 Cohort 1 participating high schools. The participating Cohort I high schools made an average of 44.5% passage rate in reading/language arts during 2009-2010.

Table 12 shows that seven Cohort 1 high schools reported an increased passage of GHSGT LAR from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +2.2% change in Lucey Laney High School to +19.1% change in Manchester High School. Of the total Cohort 1 high schools, six reported a decreased English/Language Arts achievement – R/ELA change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -1.9% in Douglass High School to -11.1+% in Henry County High School. The participating Cohort1 high schools made an overall +2.6% average percentage point gain in English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 1 middle and high schools were in the second year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data (third year of implementation) that will reflect the impact during Year 4 of the SPDG will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

### **1/2.m – Standards in Reading/English/Language Arts in Cohort 2 Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

### **Middle Schools:**

Table 13 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement rate changes from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 13 Cohort 2 participating middle schools. Participating Cohort 2 middle schools made an average of 61.2% in reading/language arts passage during 2009-2010.

Nine Cohort 1 middle schools reported an increased English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT change from baseline to 2009-20010, ranging from +3.8% change in Richards Middle School to +17.1% change in Fort Middle School. Four Cohort 2 middle schools reported a de-

creased English/Language Arts achievement rate change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.1% change in Snellville Middle School to -10.1% change in Claxton Middle School. The Cohort 2 middle schools made an overall +4.1% average percentage point gain English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 13 also provides a summary of English/Language Arts achievement percent changes from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 48 Cohort 2 participating high schools. Participating Cohort I high schools made an average of 49.4% in reading/language arts passage during 2009-2010.

Twenty Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased English/Language Arts achievement/RELA change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.6% change in Central High School to +40.4% change in Jonesboro High School. Of the total Cohort 1 high schools, 25 reported a decreased English/Language Arts achievement – R/ELA change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -2.3% change in Parkview High School to –50.0% change in Dawson County High School. Two participating Cohort 2 high schools had too few students to report in baseline years, and one school did not report data during Year 4. The participating Cohort 2 high schools made an overall -3.6% average percentage point loss in English/Language Arts achievement/R/ELA CRCT from baseline to 2009-2010.

The participating Cohort 2 middle and high schools were in the first year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data that will reflect the impact during Year 4 (second year of implementation) will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

### **1/2.n – Standards in Math in Cohort I Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

#### **Middle Schools:**

Table 14 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment also provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the first intervention year (2008-2009) for the 16 Cohort 1 participating middle schools. The participating Cohort 1 middle schools made an average of 35.9% in GHSGT Math passage during 2009-2010.

Eleven Cohort 1 middle schools reported an increased math achievement percent change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.5 change in Henry Middle School to +29.5% change in Bagley Middle School. Of the 16 total Cohort 1 middle schools, five reported a decreased math achievement rate percent change from baseline to 2008-2009, ranging from –1.0% change in Rutland Middle School to -18.2% change in W.S. Hornsby Middle School. The participating Cohort 1 middle schools made an overall +7.6% average percentage point gain in math from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 14 also provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 12 Cohort 1 participating high schools. The participating Cohort 1 high schools made an average of 31.1% in GHSGT Math passage during 2009-2010.

Seven Cohort 1 high schools reported an increased math achievement percent change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.2% change in Murray County High School to +12.9% change in Douglass High School. Five of the Cohort 1 high schools reported a decreased math achievement rate percent change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.3% change in Baldwin High School to -11.7% in Henry County High School. The participating Cohort 1 high schools made a +2.6% average percentage point gain in math.

The participating Cohort 1 middle and high schools were in the second year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-11 data (third year of implementation) that will reflect the impact during Year 4 of the SPDG will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

### **1/2.o – Standards in Math in Cohort 2 Middle and High Schools – Percent Change from Baseline to 2009-09**

### **Middle Schools:**

Table 15 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2005-2006 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for 13 Cohort 2 participating middle schools. Participating Cohort 2 middle schools made an average of 48.7% in GHSGT Math passage during 2009-2010.

Twelve Cohort 1 middle schools reported an increased math achievement percent change from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +0.6% change in Snellville Middle School to +16.5 in Brantley County Middle School, +16.7 in Clark Middle School, and +16.8% change in Fannin Middle School. Claxton Middle School reported a -7.8% change from baseline to 2009-2010. The participating Cohort 2 middle schools made a +9.2% average percentage point gain in math from baseline to 2009-2010.

### **High Schools:**

Table 15 in the Year 4 Annual Performance Report Attachment also provides a summary of math achievement rate changes from baseline (2006-2007 to 2007-2008) to the second intervention year (2009-2010) for the 48 Cohort 2 participating high schools. The participating Cohort 2 high schools made an average of 29.8% in GHSGT Math passage during 2009-2010.

Cohort 2 high schools reported an average passing GHSGT math score of 29.8% during 2009-2010. Twenty-one Cohort 2 high schools reported an increased math achievement rate from baseline to 2009-2010, ranging from +1.4% change in Charlton High School to +26.7% change in T.W. Josey Comprehensive High School. Of the 48 Cohort 2 high schools, 25 reported a decreased math achievement rate percent change from base-

line to 2009-2010, ranging from -0.4% change in Brantley County High School to -53.4% change in Marietta High School. Two high schools had too few students in baseline years to report data. The participating Cohort 2 high schools made a -5.5% average percentage point loss in math.

The participating Cohort 2 high schools were in the first year of implementation during the 2009-2010 school year (essentially Year 3 of the SPDG). The 2010-2011 data that will reflect the impact during Year 4 (second year of implementation) will not be available until fall 2011 and, thus, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Year.

**Note: Baseline data has been gathered for the above probe measures during Year 4 for Cohort 3 middle and high schools. This data will be reported in the Year 5 Annual Performance Report.**

### **Summary of Probe Data – Performance Measures 1/2i – 1/2r**

A table showing percentage point gains from baseline data to 2009-2010 for both Cohorts 1 and 2 schools is found in the Year 4 Report Attachment (see Table 16). Table 16 shows that after the second year of implementing scientifically based interventions (2009-2010), Cohort 1 middle schools made an average of +3.9 and +7.6 percentage point gains from baseline to 2009-2010 in English/Language Arts achievement/RELA and math achievement respectively. An average loss of -2.9 percentage points in absenteeism for more than 15 days (i.e., increased retention) was found from baseline to 2009-2010.

After the first year of implementation, Cohort 2 middle schools made an increased average of +4.1 and +9.2 percentage point gain from baseline to 2009-2010 in English/Language Arts achievement/RELA and GHSGT/math achievement respectively. Cohort 2 middle schools made an average loss of -0.2 percentage point in absenteeism for more than 15 days (i.e. increased retention).

For Cohort 1 high schools, the following average increases in percentage points were found from baseline to the second year of implementation in 2009-2010 (i.e., +2.6 in English/Language Arts achievement, +2.2 in GHSGT math achievement, +10.2 in the graduation rate for all students, +9.8 in the graduation rate for students with disabilities, and +2.0 in dropout rate for all students. Small average percentage point losses were found from baseline to 2009-2010 in absenteeism for more than 15 days (-1.6), dropout rate for all students (-2.0), and for dropout rates for students with disabilities (-2.5).

Cohort 2 high schools showed average increases in percentage points from baseline to the first year of implementation in 2009-2010 in absenteeism of more than 15 days (+2.4), graduation rate for all students (+9.5) and graduation rate for students with disabilities (+8.8). Decreases in averaged percentage points from baseline to 2009-2010 were made by Cohort 2 high schools in English/Language Arts achievement/RELA (-3.6), GHSGT math achievement (-5.5), dropout rate for all students (-1.9), and dropout rate for students with disabilities (-0.9).

Probe data gathered during Year 4 of the SPDG (i.e., third year of implementation for Cohort 1 and second year of implementation for Cohort 2) will not be available until summer 2011. Therefore, this data will be reported in the Year 5 Annual Performance Report.



### **1/2.p – Discipline Actions in Cohort 1 Schools**

During Year 4, a Progress Assessment Tool, developed in Year 3, measured progress of a student sample in three data probes, including in and out-of-school suspension. During the first and second data interval (first Semester) of Year 4, 76.6% (837/1,093) of Cohort 1 sample students in grades 5-12 had no in or out-of-school suspensions. This compares to 64.7% during the first semester in Year 3.

Of the total Year 4 sample of 1,093 Cohort 1 students, 81.4% had no in-school suspensions and 91.3% had no out-of-school suspensions. Cohort 1 is in the third year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies.

### **1/2.q – Discipline Actions in Cohort 2 Schools**

During Year 4, the Progress Assessment Tool measured progress by a Cohort 2 student sample in three data probes, including in and out-of-school suspension. During the first and second data interval (first Semester) of Year 4, 73.2% (1,810/2,472) of the Cohort 1 sample students in grades 5-12 had no in or out-of-school suspensions. This compares to 71.0% during the reporting period in Year 3 as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

Of the total Year 4 sample of 2,472 Cohort 2 students, 77.1% had no in-school suspensions, and 87.4% had no out-of-school suspensions. Cohort 2 is in the second year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies.

### **1/2.r – Discipline Actions in Cohort 3 Schools**

During Year 4, the Progress Assessment Tool measured progress of a Cohort 3 student sample for in and out-of-school suspension. During the first and second data interval (first Semester) of Year 4, 73.4% (1,565/2,133) of the Cohort 3 sample students in grades 5-12 had no in or out-of-school suspensions.

Of the total Year 4 sample of 2,133 sample students, 79.4% had no in-school suspensions and 87.7% had no out-of-school suspensions. Cohort 3 is in the first year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.s – Attendance Rate for Cohort 1 Schools**

During Year 4, a Progress Assessment Tool, developed in Year 3, measured progress of a student sample in attendance. During the first and second data interval (first Semester) of Year 4, 76.6% (837/1,093) of Cohort 1 sample students in grades 5-12 had an average of 3.2 days of school absence. Cohort 1 is in the third year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.t – Attendance Rate for Cohort 2 Schools**

During Year 4, data from the Progress Assessment Tool for the first two data intervals (first semester) in 2010-2011 showed that students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 2 schools had an average of 2.9 days of school absence, compared to 5.8 days during the same reporting period during Year 3. Cohort 2 is in the second year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.u – Attendance Rate for Cohort 3 Schools**

During Year 4, data from the Progress Assessment Tool for the first two data intervals (first semester) in 2010-2011 showed that students in grades 5-12 within Cohort 3 schools had an average of 3.0 days of school absence. Cohort 3 is in the first year of implementation of strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.v – Course Failures in Cohort 1 Schools**

During Year 4, data from the Progress Assessment Tool for the first two data intervals (first semester) in 2010-2011 showed that 49.7% (543/1,093) of the Cohort 1 sample students in grades 5-12 had no course failures. Cohort 1 is in the third year of implementing strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.w – Course Failures in Cohort 2 Schools**

During Year 4, data from the Progress Assessment Tool for the first two data intervals (first semester) in 2010-2011 showed that 62.5% (1,546/2,472) of the Cohort 2 sample students in grades 5-12 had no course failures, compared to 37.3% during the first assessment period during Year 3. Cohort 2 is in the second year of implementing strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.x – Course Failures in Cohort 3 Schools**

During Year 4, data from the Progress Assessment Tool for the first two data intervals (first semester) in 2010-2011 showed that 57.5% (1,226/2,133) of the Cohort 3 sample students in grades 5-12 had no course failures, Cohort 3 is in the first year of implementing strategic dropout prevention strategies as a part of the GraduateFIRST project.

### **1/2.y Replication of Scientific- or Evidence-Based Practices**

The Georgia SPDG has replicated implementation of dropout prevention/school improvement activities in three Cohorts. During Year 4, 28 Cohort 1 schools (16 middle schools, and 12 high schools) and 61 Cohort 2 schools (13 middle schools and 48 high schools) continued to implement scientifically-based interventions related to selected Priority Improvement Areas. During Year 4, 53 additional Cohort 3 schools/programs (21 middle schools, 24 high schools, six Mountain Education Centers, and two statewide behavior support programs) participated in the GraduateFIRST project., As of Year 4 of the SPDG (2011), a total of 142 Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 schools were implementing programs and strategies to improve graduation rates and reduce dropouts for students with and without disabilities.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # H323A070012

**A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 1:** Through the use of trained teachers and the implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math, students with disabilities at the middle school and high school level will increase their access to the general curriculum and make statistically significant literacy/reading (English/Language Arts) and math gains over their baseline (entry level) scores and/or against comparable control groups.

**Objective 1.4:** Parent/family engagement will increase within Cohort schools to enhance positive student outcomes for all students with disabilities.

1.4.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increased number of Cohort schools forming a Circle of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉ).	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		10	/	100%	3	8/10	80

1.4.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percentage of the CAFÉ teams within Cohort schools reporting changed school practices as a result of CAFÉ work.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		See Narrative	/	See Narrative

1.4.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of school systems whose middle and high schools are participating in Cohort 1, 2, and 3 of the SPDG reporting	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

parent mentors providing support to parents.							11/28 – Cohort 1	39.3- Cohort 1
							24/61 – Cohort 2	39.3 - Cohort 2
							13/53 - Cohort 3	24.5 - Cohort 3

1.4.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of parents participating in webinars reporting that the training provided relevant information needed to make decisions about their child’s education.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
							Average 85.3

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**1.4.a – Formation of Circles of Adults Focusing on Education (CAFÉs)**

**1.4.b – Changed Practices Resulting from CAFÉ work**

A CAFÉ (Circle of Adults Focusing on Education) is a method or a process of collaborative team problem solving on the local/community level to improve student achievement. The CAFÉ team typically includes at least three family members and several building-level decision makers. The team focuses on identifying and launching sustainable initiatives/activities to impact student success. CAFÉ dialogue meetings are approximately two hours.

During Year 2, SPDG staff supported the implementation of pilot CAFÉs in two schools/counties—Manchester High School (Meriwether County) and Rutland High School (Bibb County). A new CAFÉ was initiated during Year 3 in Elbert High School, Elbert County Schools. The goal of the three CAFÉ’s has been to create short-term and long-term solutions to engage families in ensuring that students graduate with a general education diploma. These two CAFÉs continued their work during Year 4 and the concept of Mini-CAFÉs was introduced to Cohort schools.

The goal of the CAFÉs in Manchester, Rutland, and Elbert during Years 3 and 4 has been to create short-term and long-term solutions to engage families in ensuring that students graduate with a general education diploma. Following is a summary of some of the positive outcomes as a result of the work of these three CAFÉs:

**Manchester CAFÉ (Meriwether County)**

- Formation of a new PTA chapter was formed in the high school with 125 who signed up to participate.

- Involvement of church members, who have passed background checks, who go into the high school every Friday to work with students in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade advisories on self determination and other issues.
- Changes within Manchester High School in percent points from baseline (2006-08) to 2009-2010 including +19.1 in GHS GT LAR. +.07 percentage points in math achievement, -6.5 percentage points in absenteeism of 14 or more days (increased attendance), +20.5 percentage point in graduation rate of all students, +23.1 percentage points in graduation of students with disabilities, -2.8 percentage points in dropout rate for all students, and -4.8 percent points in dropout rate for all students.

### **Rutland High School (Bibb County)**

- Formation of a new PTA.
- Creation of a large computer generated map of the Rutland High School neighborhoods/feeder zones.
- Completion of a student survey to help the CAFÉ understand the main issues facing Rutland students. This data will help structure some of the CAFÉ work in the future.
- Exploration of other issues including tutoring opportunities for the students and needed transportation to allow the students to participate.
- Use of space and computers by high school students in the new Challenge Center facility at the local church.
- Hiring of a Title I Parent Involvement Coordinator as a home/school facilitator due to the CAFÉ work.
- Completion of a parent satisfaction survey to identify parental concerns regarding their child/youth's achievement.
- Changes within Rutland High School in percentage points from baseline (2006-08) to 2009-2010 including -4.1 in GHS GT LAR. +4.2 percent points in math achievement, -.5.1 percentage points in absenteeism of 14 or more days (increased attendance), +7.6 percentage point in graduation rate of all students, +8.1 percentage points in graduation of students with disabilities, +0.8 percentage points in dropout rate for all students, and -2.5 percentage points in dropout rate for all students.

### **Elbert High School (Elbert County)**

- A Collaboration Coach has been assigned to assist the new CAFÉ in Elbert High School.
- A local school system profile was developed to assist with data-based decisions regarding CAFÉ activities.
- Development of a CAFÉ mission.
- Provision of key chain/flash drives to the ninth grade students with the label “Determine your fate—Graduate!”
- Tracking of the achievement progress of target students.
- Posting banners in all schools with the “Grad Devil” logo and mission statement/slogan.
- Use of positive graduation comments when writing articles for the town newspaper.
- Implementation of “Grad Devil Week” in the schools and on the radio.
- Booth at the Elbert County Fall Festival where window decals for automobiles were sold with the Grad Devil logo and a graduation year.
- Presentations to the systems district change team regarding the importance of early intervention in early elementary school to positively impact academic success, reduction of dropouts, and increased graduation.
- Sharing of information regarding the “Grad Devil Week” at elementary school fall festivals.
- Hosting of information sessions for parents to discuss graduation requirements and ways to motivate their children/youth.

- Changes within Elbert High School in percent points from baseline (2006-08) to 2009-2010 including -1.7 in CHSGT LAR. +9.8 percent points in math achievement, +0.8 percent points in absenteeism of 14 or more days, +12.4 percent point in graduation rate of all students, -3.5 percent points in graduation of students with disabilities, -5.4% points in dropout rate for all students, and -5.9 percent points in dropout rate for all students.

The CAFÉs in all three sites are collaborating with the local Parent Involvement Coordinators from Title I and Resource Coordinators in PreK to create consistent data and planning from early intervention through graduation.

As a part of the planning meetings during Year 4 leading to the formation of Mini-CAFÉs in Wayne, Appling, Haralson, Thomason/Upson, and Barton, the following activities were carried out:

- Training of CAFÉ facilitators.
- Discussion of benchmarks for the initial Mini-CAFÉ meeting.
- Review of research regarding effective parent engagement.
- Coaching regarding effective recruitment of team members.

#### **1.4.c – Parent Mentor Support for Families in Cohort Schools**

The Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership collaborates with more than 80 local school systems and over 140,000 families raising children with learning and/or physical challenges with the purpose of increasing parental involvement in special education.

Created and partially funded by the Georgia Department of Education's Division for Special Education Services and Supports, parent mentors are moms and/or dads hired by local school systems to bridge communication between school personnel, special education directors, parents, school teams, teachers and the community. Together, they collaborate to increase parent involvement in solving concerns and gaining ground on targeted goals to improve all children's achievement. The Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership meets 2-3 times a year statewide and four times regionally.

Mentors build connections for families in the community, concentrate on transition needs of high school students and young children, lead task forces, organize training sessions, collaborate with teachers and increase parent involvement activities in schools.

As of Year 4, there are 11 of the twenty-eight Cohort 1 schools (39.3%) with parent mentors, twenty-four of the 61 (39.3%) Cohort 2 schools have parent mentors, and 13 of fifty-three Cohort 3 schools (28.9%) have mentors all working with school-based teams to increase parent engagement as a critical component of dropout prevention and student achievement.

#### **1.4d – Parent Satisfaction with Webinars.**

Georgia's Parent to Parent of Georgia (P2P) is a strategic SPDG partner assisting in enhancing parent engagement throughout Georgia. Following is a summary of activities carried out during Year 4 by P2P and Georgia parent mentors:

**April 4, 2010 – June 30, 2010 (early part of the SPDG Year 4 performance period):**

- A new parent mentor manual was updated so that coaching can be consistent throughout the state.
- The Parent Outreach Coach compiled contact information for all 200 members of the Parent Mentor Partnership.
- A Family Engagement Toolkit was produced with the editing and writing assistance of the Parent Outreach Coach. The Southwest Regional Resource Center produced 500 copies of this Family Engagement Toolkit. The Toolkits were placed on the GaDOE website as well.
- The Parent Outreach Coach and the Family Engagement Specialist provide materials and agendas for consistent delivery of six regional meetings. A total of 80 parent mentors attended six regional meetings.
- The Parent Outreach Coach and the Family Engagement Specialist led a CAFÉ Dialogue with the Elbert Team. The result of this meeting was a commitment by all 15 members to work on a plan to prevent dropout, particularly of students with disabilities.
- The Parent Outreach Coach organized and led a CAFE information meeting in November 2010 in Elbert County with the SPDG Cohort 2 team. Follow-up technical assistance was provided to this team by the Parent Outreach Coach.
- The Parent Mentor website was re-designed with web-based resources related to family engagement. The website was edited and operational by the early part of Year 4 of the SPDG.
- A statewide retreat for parent mentors was held on August 30-September 1 in Lake Blackshear.
- A total of 4,212 families received information by telephone by the parent mentors. Another 946 families were connected with a supporting parent during this period.
- Nine new self-advocacy modules were completed.
- Two webinars were conducted for parents of students with disabilities on topics including IEPs, Response to Intervention, and dispute resolution.
- A total of 146 local education agencies received print resources for parents of students. A total of 63 face-to-face meetings were conducted by P2P with special education directors to share information and resources.
- During this same time period, a total of 234 informational events held in local communities that were attended by P2P staff where educational materials were disseminated. A total of 2,736 parents attended these informational events.
- During April 4, 2010 and June 30, 2010, 50 new Navigator Team leaders were trained to facilitate family engagement in local communities.

**July 1-2010 – December 31, 2011:**

- Technical assistance and follow-up support was provided for parent mentors in local education agencies.
- Assistance was provided in the collection and analysis of data to document the impact of parent engagement activities for school systems employing parent mentors. New data forms were developed and completed.
- Web-based resources were developed and published related to family engagement for the Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership. Ten “Terri’s Tips” documents and 11 “Tip Sheets” were produced.
- Twelve new articles were added to the website.

- There were a total of 364 website hits on the website.
- Meetings and conferences were coordinated for parents with disabilities to support the development of parent leadership skills. These meetings and conferences included: the Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership Retreat, Rookie Orientation, quarterly regional meetings, an Annual Kick-off Conference, and statewide Transition Steering Committee meetings.
- Technical assistance and training was provided related to dropout prevention, graduation, and academic achievement of students with disabilities—in coordination with P2P.
- In September 2010, a Spanish version of the website for P2P of Georgia was introduced. In addition, efforts were ongoing to increase the reach to families through the P2P Education email newsletter that currently has 968 subscribers. Social networking opportunities have also been created (i.e., 630 follow Parent2Parent on Facebook, while another 85 follow on Twitter).
- From October 2010 to December 31, 2010, a year-long redesign and updating of the Roadmap to Services was initiated (i.e., re-design the graphics, making the Roadmap easier and more timely). The first meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee responsible for re-design work. By the end of December 2010, The Roadmap to Services, with updated graphics, was converted to a content management system for further work.
- Satisfaction data regarding P2P services was collected in fall 2010 through telephone surveys with a random sample of parents. Findings showed that 96% of respondents stated that the information they received was very useful to them, and 96% of respondents indicated that they were provided with information that was needed to help them make decisions about their child’s education.
- Revisions and updates to the Supporting Parent training were completed with PowerPoints and trainer notes.
- Self advocacy modules were completed and schools and systems were recruited to pilot modules including additional sites in the southwest and southeast regions of the state.
- Initial drafts of one-page, parent friendly information sheets on four special education topics were developed.
- Two webinars were in November, 2010 and in December 2010, and three were completed in March 2011 on IEPs and dispute resolution. At the November 2010 webinar on IEPs and dispute resolution, 92% of the respondents indicated that the session met their expectations and 95.5% indicated that the session provided them with relevant information needed to make decisions about their child’s education. At the December 2010 webinar on engaging families in helping students with disabilities stay in school and graduate, 100% of the respondents indicated that the session met their expectation; and 75% indicated that the session provided them with relevant information needed to make decisions about their child’s education. An average of 85.3% of the parents participating in webinars felt that the training provided relevant information needed to make decisions about their child’s education,
- Planning occurred with the GaDOE regarding the development of training for professionals on the parent perspective and cultural sensitivity to improve meeting and facilitation skills.
- A total of 2,295 families provided information by telephone through the P2P; and 398 families connected with a supporting parent.
- The following progress was made in six strategic areas:

**1. Technical assistance and training for parents related to dropout prevention and graduation/transition.**

- A total of 118 trainings/workshops were offered by P2P (i.e., two hour course on an overview of special education, the IFSP/IEP, parental rights, Medicaid basics, home/community-based services, transition, assistive technology, writing measurable goals, school discipline, and empowerment from literacy and adulthood.
- These trainings were attended by 757 parents.



**2. Pilot training of professionals in three GLRS regions.**

- A total of 351 professionals attended trainings offered by P2P.

**3. Development of web pages for Regional Interagency Transition Councils.**

- Web pages were completed and brought live on the P2P website in November 2010 for Regional Transition Councils to help connect families with resources and trainings.

**4. Development and delivery of webinars on secondary transition.**

- Webinars related to secondary transition were in development including identification of presenters and scheduling.

**5. Training of a minimum of ten Early Childhood Literacy Communities of Practice within four to five school systems.**

- Five Early Literacy Communities of Practice were formed (Gwinnett, Seminole, Franklin, Emanuel and Clay County school systems) in spring/summer 2010; and Habersham, Ware, and Liberty county school systems were formed in fall 2010. These Early Literacy Communities of Practice were ongoing throughout the remainder of the SPDG Year 4. Madison and Houston County school systems have expressed interest in participation. The purpose of the Early Childhood Literacy Communities of Practice are to inform and support families in promoting early literacy activities for their young children.

**6. IEP clinics for all and Hispanic families to go over child-specific issues.**

- Target IEP clinic sites were selected in the following county school systems: Rome/Floyd County, Meriwether County, Oconee County, Thomas County, and Bulloch County. Planning of IEP clinics for Hispanic families occurred in October 1, 2010 and December 31, 2010 in Clayton, Gwinnett, and DeKalb..



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # H323A07001

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 3:** Students with disabilities and other students at risk for school failure will have effective transition in school and from school to post school outcomes.

**Objective 3.1** Regional Interagency Transition Councils will work with Cohort schools to implement effective transition for students with disabilities and other students who are at risk for school failure.

3.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Increased number of operational Regional Interagency Transition Councils.	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		14			6	6/12	50.0

3.1.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of Regional Interagency Transition Councils that report positive transition outcomes in the schools that they serve as a result of their work.	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	100%		6 /6	See Narrative Below

3.1.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of schools not passing Indicator 13 (Transition) showing increased knowledge regarding compliant transition plans, as indicated by improvements on post-training tests.	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/	100		158/210	75.2

3.1.d Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
---------------------------	--------------	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Number of Project ASPIRE schools implementing student-led IEPs.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/	12	12	12/12	100

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**3.1.a – Formation of Regional Transition Councils**

A long-range goal is to have a total of at least 12 Regional Transition Councils in the GLRS regions. At the end of the Year 3 SPDG performance period, there were six operational Regional Transition Councils. Two Councils (i.e., SW Georgia - Albany and Middle Georgia- Macon) were formed in the first cadre. The first (informational) meetings of these Councils were held in January and February of 2009. The second cadre included the formation of the following Regional Transition Councils: Three Rivers - Claxton, Georgia Mountains - Cleveland, Coastal Plains - Lenox; and Coastal Georgia – Hinesville. The first (informational) meetings of these Councils were held in September and October 2009.

Three additional Regional Transition Councils (Cohort 3) held their first meeting in fall 2010 (Year 4 of the SPDG): Metro South GLRS(Griffin), SE Georgia GLRS (Waycross), and West Georgia GLRS (Grantville). Currently, one work group is meeting to form the Heart of Georgia Regional Transition Alliance (Dublin, Georgia). Informational meetings designed to interest decision makers in the project have been held in Rome, and in Augusta, and an informational meeting is scheduled in Jasper. An additional informational meeting is being planned for Columbus, but is not yet scheduled.

The current goal is to include 3 council work groups in the fourth cadre. With the addition of Councils being created by these three Cohort 4 Regional Council work groups, a total of 12 Regional Interagency Transition Councils will be operational during Year 5 of the SPDG in Cohorts 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Originally, there was a goal of establishing 14 Regional Transitional Councils in the GLRS regions. The SPDG Coordinator of this effort has met with reluctance to engage in the project on the part of the decision makers. It is thought that this reluctance is related to the lengthy period of 10% unemployment in Georgia, as well as other ongoing economic challenges. Transition personnel in school systems are being reduced due to the end of stimulus funds, agency personnel are experiencing similar cuts, and business representatives have not rebounded from the downturn and are not hiring.

The SPDG coordinator of Goal 3 participated in 23 meetings during the Year 4 performance period (April 2009 – April 2010) to provide additional assistance and support in the formation and operation of Regional Council meetings and Work Groups.

### **3.1.b – Positive Outcomes as a Result of the Work of Regional Transition Councils**

During Year 4, a consultant was hired to provide follow-up support to the Regional Transition Councils to be certain that Resource Mapping was carried out and an Action Plan was developed and implemented. Although there is not quantitative data regarding positive outcomes of the work of the Regional Transition Councils during Year 4, Action Plans are in place and are being carried out. Some examples of positive work include:

- Increased involvement of business leaders
- Interview on the Public Broadcasting Network regarding transition.
- Use of public service announcements aimed at potential employers and at parents and/or people with disabilities who are seeking more information regarding transition.
- The Winner’s Circle Award has been given to local businesses that have gone above and beyond in helping individuals with disabilities find jobs. Business leaders have been appointed as advisors to committees to keep them engaged and focused on improving employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities.
- The Coastal Georgia Transition Council has been working toward increasing positive employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities by working with supported employment agencies to highlight the services that exist to help employers and employees with disabilities.
- Students in Macon State Technology have designed a website for the Middle Georgia Transition Team for the community to use when seeking information about transition.
- The Middle Georgia Transition Council has established a Micro-Board as a method to receive assistance for students to learn self-advocacy and possibly receive assistance when they graduate from high school.
- The North Georgia Transition Council has focused on publicity regarding the Council work and how to bring the communities together for an Expo or Fair in their area on transition.

### **3.1c – Improved Transition Planning and Transition Plan Development**

During 2009-2010, 19 school districts were required to receive assistance in order to meet the state’s Indicator 13 in Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP). Eighteen agreed to work with two consultants hired to provide transition training, planning, and follow-up technical assistance tailored to each school district based on a review of actual transition plans evaluation based on a rubric. SPDG resources provided one consultant day and one-half day of follow-up assistance. During Year 4, seven transition planning trainings were held for 297 school district personnel—see Table 19 in the Annual Performance Report for a listing of transition training carried out during Year 4 of the SPDG..

### **3.1d – Positive Outcomes as a result of Implementing Student-led IEPs (ASPIRE)**

During Year 4, Project ASPIRE (Active Student Participation Inspires Real Engagement) was initiated in order to implement student-led IEPs as a way of improving the quality of IEPs, including transition plans. Project ASPIRE is being implemented for 72 students in 12 schools. Of the total 12 schools, six are Cohort 1, 2, or 3 schools.

Evaluation instruments used during Year 4 included:

## **Participant Satisfaction**

- Pre-rubric form for educators, families, and students.
- IEP exit survey for families, students, and teachers to gather information regarding perceptions of the extent to which the IEP was carried out efficiently and whether students and parents were meaningfully involved and satisfied with their participation.
- Participant evaluations in student-led trainings.
- Number of trainings and number of participants

## **Participant Knowledge and Skills**

- Rubric for parents and students.

## **Organization Support and Change**

- Support for student led IEP meetings.
- Ongoing schedule for conducting pre and post surveys.
- Electronic format of the IEP shared after the training so each school leader has electronic and hard copies of training materials.
- Reminder to sites of data collection points.

## **Participant Use of Knowledge and Skills**

- Exit survey for parents and families.

## **Student Change**

- Number of student led IEP meetings conducted.

A rubric was also developed for use in evaluating the quality of IEP participation. Five ASPIRE Introductory trainings and five 4-hour student led IEP trainings were held for the participating schools in September and October 2010. A total of 87 special education administrators, professional learning coaches, collaboration coaches, counselors, transition coordinators, parent mentors, principals/assistants, inclusion teachers, special education teachers, and a Project Search coordinator attended these trainings on student-led IEPs. The training participants were provided electronic copies of the training materials and presentations for use with parents in the student-led IEP process. Table 18 in the Annual Report Attachment provides a summary of these Year 4 trainings/professional development opportunities.

As of the end of the Year 4 SPDG reporting period, all 12 schools were implementing student-led IEPs and utilizing the Project ASPIRE assessment procedures. Pre-assessment data has been gathered for student, educator, and family perceptions of the student led-IEP process on the following variables: IEP awareness, IEP participation, knowledge of IEP content, abilities and disability awareness, and social and communication skills. This data has been entered into a database for comparison with post-test perception data. The post-test perception data will not be available until after the deadline for submission of the Year 4 Annual Performance Report and, therefore, will be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Report. Other impact data/information will also be reported in the Year 5 SPDG Annual Performance Report.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # H323A070012

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 4:** Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

**Objective 4.1:** Special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate will be reduced from 38% to 10%.

**Objective 4.2:** Aggressive recruitment efforts will be implemented to place fully certified special education teachers within Georgia schools meeting Objective 4.1 targets.

4.1-2.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Number or percent of special education teachers in Georgia who are highly qualified.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
							16,280.20/17,700.90

4.1-2.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Documentation of positive impact as a result of IHE mini-grants aimed at increased recruitment of special education teachers in Georgia.	PROJECT	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
				/		5 See Narrative Below for Progress	/

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**4.1-2.a –Highly Qualified Special Education Teachers**

During 2007-08, 94.1% of all special education teachers (i.e., teachers of children ages 3-21) were highly qualified. This compares to 91.4% for 2008-09 and 92.0% for all teachers in 2009-2010—see below.

**2009-10 Special Education Teachers – Preschool (3-5) and School Age (6-21):**

	<b>Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Total</b>
Teachers – 3-6:	766.10 (92.4%)	63.10 (7.6%)	829.20
Teachers – 7-21	15,514.10 (91.9%)	1,357.60 (8.1%)	16,871.70
Total Teachers	16,280.20 (91.9%)	1,420.70 (8.1%)	17,700.90
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**4.1-2b – Positive Outcomes as a Result of IHE Mini-Grants**

A Special Education University Forum was held on September 30 - October 1, 2009 during Year 3, for IHE teams, including the special education chair, dean, local special education directors of school districts in their catchment area, and the Georgia Learning Resource System Director in their region, to develop regional and local plans for implementation aimed at increasing the number of certified special education teachers.

As a follow-up to that meeting and to continue the work of the Forum, those teams who developed plans could then apply for small mini-grants to provide support to the school teams in the implementation of their recruitment and retention plans. Of the 12 universities (70 participants) who attended, seven submitted applications. Three IHEs received funding (\$4,500 from the SPDG) during the early part of Year 4 and a number of recruitment activities were carried out. It is anticipated that that another Collaborative University Forum will be held in Fall 2011 to review the progress being made in this collaborative effort between universities and school districts. Following is a summary of positive results of these three IHE/school district mini-grants:

**Armstrong Atlantic University (AAU)**

- A local retreat was held in April 2010 for IHE and school district stakeholders to develop future goals, action plans, and pilot programs to meet local school district needs for special educators.
- Promotional materials regarding stakeholders’ services were developed in various mediums by the IHE/LEA partners (i.e., brochures, web resources, etc.).
- Open houses and recruitment fairs were held from Spring to Fall of 2010 on campus, at schools, and in the community to recruit multiple populations into special education. A total of 125 teachers attended a recruitment table hosted at the Savannah-Chatham County School Systems’ new teacher orientation. A major on-campus recruitment event was carried out during fall 2010.
- An Education Living and Learning Community of 19 IHE/LEA partners was established. This seeded the pipeline with new students in special education and helped maintain consistent enrollment in their MAT program in special education during a time when enrollment for most other advanced degrees around the college was declining.
- The feasibility of establishing a SCEC chapter for the southeast region of Georgia was explored.

## **College of Coastal Georgia (CCGA)**

- Thirteen teacher candidates in Glynn County and three in Camden County partnered in school inclusion settings over the course of a semester for at least eight hours.
- Learning teams of one special education teacher and one general education teacher were developed within and across inclusion classrooms. Outcomes of this effort included 100% completion of practicum experiences by candidates—with a 100% course passage rate. In addition, 75% of the scores on the candidates' assessment aligned with Class Keys were at proficient or above.
- Academic coursework was linked to practicum experiences and completed in a team format with input from all learning team members---experienced and novice. This resulted in a 100% course passage rate in May 2010.
- Three meetings and ongoing email and other correspondence were carried out that encouraged collaboration between CCGA faculty and school personnel to provide information relevant to beginning teachers regarding curriculum, paperwork processes, and mentoring relationships.
- The CCGA partnered with the TIP program in the high schools to transfer three credits to CCGA. Information was also provided to the TIP program in the high schools and the AVID program that feeds into the TIP program regarding CCGA's dual certification program with special education. Students were invited to campus for orientation programs
- Overall, the IHE mini-grant activities allowed CCGA to increase and improve candidates' practice in collaborative co-teaching; deepen relationships with surrounding school districts in supporting innovative teaching and training, and benefits by the candidates with regard to their achievement on CCGA assessments for field experiences and in special education coursework.

## **Kennesaw State University (KSU)**

- In partnership with the Cobb County School District, a cohort of 25 paraprofessionals were recruited by the end of spring 2010 semester using promotional materials, a rigorous application process, and consultation with appropriate school district supervisors.
- A new MAT in special education was developed in partnership with Cobb County and support of KSU's Department of Inclusive Education, and the Dean of Education. Further development of the new MAT occurred during Year 4.
- During 2010, a three-course curriculum for a cohort of 25 paraprofessionals was initiated during Year 3 of the SPDG, with the first class beginning in August 2010 (i.e., Introduction to Exceptional Populations). This course and the next one provided (i.e., Education of Exceptional Students) were provided free to the cohort participants.
- Overall, KSU identified a group of promising, highly recommended and motivated paraprofessionals that initiated their training as special education teachers. These students are enthusiastic and interested in pursuing their coursework in special education.





**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award #H323A070012

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 4:** Teacher competency and skills will be increased by employing only fully certified special education teachers.

**Objective 4.3:** The special education teacher retention rate will continue to be monitored for maintaining a 65 percent rate over five years for first-time teachers

4.3.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Statewide for 2010, the percent of all highly qualified novice special education teachers, who remain teaching two years beyond their initial employment (Federal Performance Measure 3.1).	<b>PROGRAM PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		100		/

4.3.b Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of beginning teachers and coaches reporting that they strongly agreed that induction training received met their needs.	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/				5/9 9/19

4.3.c Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Average percent of special education teachers, induction coaches, and site administrators reporting very positive impact	<b>PROJECT</b>	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%

of the pilot induction program on the roles and responsibilities of the beginning special education teachers being mentored.			/			/	38.3 – Teachers 31.6 – Coaches 58.2 – Site Administrators
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	---

<b>4.3.d Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
Average percent of site administrators and induction coaches reporting very positive impact of the pilot induction program on the students with disabilities.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	51.0 – Site Administrators 30.7 – Coaches

<b>4.3.e Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
Average percent of beginning special education teachers and site administrators reporting that the coaching received was Very Supportive or Very beneficial.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	77.4 - Beginning Tchrs 71.7 – Site Administrators

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**4.3.a – Special Education Retention**

As displayed in Figure 1 of the Annual Report Attachment, following is a summary of two-year retention rates for the last five time periods:

Ending in 2010, there was a retention rate of 82.5%  
Ending in 2009, there was a retention rate of 89.02%  
Ending in 2008, there was a retention rate of 95.56%  
Ending in 2007, there was a retention rate of 92.10%  
Ending in 2006, there was a retention rate of 78.54%

As can be seen by this information, the 2-year retention rate has increased from 78.5% in 2006 to 82.5% for 2010. This is a slight reduction from the previous two-year period ending in 2009. The small downward fluctuation in 2009 and 2010 may be in part attributed to the economic stress that LEAs were under, requiring them to reduce staff to meet budgetary requirements.

The state of Georgia also follows the percentage of special and general education teachers who have been retained for one, three, and five years (see Figure 2). Figure 3 in the Annual Report attachment shows the comparison of 1-year special education and general education teacher attrition trend over the past seven years.

#### **4.3.b – Positive Impact as a Result of Induction Support and Assistance.**

During Year 4, the GaDOE implemented a pilot Teacher Induction Program for new special education teachers within five school systems. This pilot is utilizing the knowledge gained by the Year 3 task force that reviewed other states' (as well as international) teacher induction models. In addition, draft standards and the model of induction to be implemented were developed during Year 3. The following extensive data collection plan was implemented in Year 4 within the pilot Teacher Induction Program.

##### **Pre-Assessments:**

1. Induction Coach pre-assessment and post assessment.
2. Beginning teacher pre-assessment.

##### **Teacher Retention Data:**

1. Baseline information from beginning teachers regarding reasons for entering special education and short and long-term intentions.
2. Number of beginning teachers remaining in the school/system as a special education teacher after Year 1.
3. Number of beginning teachers remaining in the school/system as a special education teacher after Year 2.
4. Number of beginning teachers remaining in the school/system as a special education teacher after Year 3.

##### **Perception Data:**

1. Feedback and evaluations from 2 1/2 days of induction coach training, as well as from each of the regional and state trainings for beginning SETs and indication coaches.
2. Data from the needs assessment compared to data from post-assessment to determine perceived growth in knowledge and skills for beginning SETs and indication coaches.
3. Beginning SETs perceptions of their relationship with and the effectiveness of their education coaches.

4. Induction coaches' perceptions of their relationships with and their effectiveness in supporting beginning SETS.
5. Site administrators' perceptions of the effectiveness of the induction coaches and the impact of induction on beginning SETS.

### **Formative Assessments**

1. Observation data collected by induction coaches during their structured classroom observations of beginning teachers, as well as ways in which the data is used to inform and/or modify coaching strategies and beginning teachers' teaching and learning strategies.
2. Monthly electronic surveys for beginning teachers, induction coaches, and site administrators.

### **Program Evaluation**

1. Analysis of all data collected throughout the year.
2. End of year surveys.
3. End of year reflections and self-assessments.
4. Conference calls with participant groups (beginning teachers, induction coaches, and site administrators on May 31<sup>st</sup>).

Draft standards were created and a model of support was created in Year 3 for use in the pilot Induction Program during Year 4. Training began for site administrators in June 2010 regarding effective hiring of Induction Coaches. Two webinars were conducted June and July of 2010 with site administrators on effective hiring of Induction Coaches. An Induction Coach Institute was held in July 2010 for ten Induction Coaches regarding the induction framework, adult learning, the role of the Induction Coach, rapport and trust strategies, strategies for clarifying and mediating questions as well as reflecting conversations. During October 2010 and again in January 2011, training was provided for new special education teachers and Induction Coaches in the participating school systems on various topics such as present levels, SMART goals, progress monitoring, feedback, CLASS keys, professional growth plans, differentiation, AYP strategies, and behavior strategies. Additional training webinars were held for Induction Coaches in August, September, November, and December 2010 on topics such as effective induction strategies, contact logs, IEPs, data collection and reflection, supports and technology for math for students with disabilities, and sharing of successes as well as seeking solutions.

In the July 2010 webinar, all (100%) of the Induction Coaches reported that the professional development received was relevant to their job as an Induction Coach and that the training met their expectations and provided information that they could use. Participant evaluations for the October 2010 Induction Coach/Beginning Teacher training showed that 47.8% of the teachers and 55.6% of the coaches reported that they strongly agreed that the induction training received met their needs. Of the January 2011 training participants (i.e., beginning special education teachers and Induction Coaches), 76.7% reported that the training provided useful information that they could use to improve student achievement.

Table 20 in the Annual Report Attachment provides a summary of Induction Trainings/professional development opportunities provided during Year 4 of the SPDG.

### **4.3c – Positive Impact on the Beginning Teacher as a Result of Induction Support**

Perception data was gathered monthly regarding the effectiveness of the pilot induction program during Year 4 of the SPDG. Data gathered from September, 2010 to January 2011 showed that an average of 38.3% of the beginning teachers, 31.6% of the induction coaches, and 58.2% of the

site administrators reported that the pilot induction program was having a positive impact on the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers in the participating schools. An average of 59.2% of the beginning teachers reported that their participation in the induction program has reinforced their original intent of being a special education teacher.

#### **4.3d – Positive Impact of Teacher Induction Support on Special Education Students**

Average perception data gathered from September 2010 to January 2011 also showed that 51.0% of the site administrators and 30.7% of the induction coaches reported that the pilot induction program was having a very positive impact on students with disabilities in the participating schools.

#### **4.3e – Support Received by Induction Coaches**

Average perception data gathered from September 2010 to January 2011 indicated that 77.4% of the beginning teachers reported that the support being received by the induction coach was very supportive. The support being received by the induction coach was rated on the average as very beneficial by 71.7% of the site administrators.

Data is also being gathered regarding the type of assistance that the Induction Coaches are providing. Following is the average number of hours spent in several Induction activities from August, 2010 to February 2011:

Preparation Time – 26.09 Hours  
Pre/Post Conferences – 30.23 Hours  
Observations – 116.54 Hours  
Cognitive Coaching – 7.92 Hours  
Collaboration – 52.89 Hours  
Professional Development – 50.56 Hours  
Other – 3.15 Hours



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award #H323A070012

**SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**       Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

**Goal 5:** Parents of preschool children within the targeted schools in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 will increase participation to ensure smooth and effective transitions from home or Part C programs to preschool programs.

**Objective 5.1** – Preschoolers who are at risk and/or have a disability will increase their literacy skills.

5.1.a Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Percentage of parents reporting positive benefits from the work of Early Literacy Communities of Practice.	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/		NA		NA

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

**5.1a – Formation of Early Literacy Communities of Practice.**

Five Early Literacy Communities of Practice were formed (Gwinnett, Seminole, Franklin, Emanuel and Clay County School Systems) in spring/summer 2010, and Habersham, Ware, and Liberty county school systems were formed in fall 2010. These Early Literacy Communities of Practice were ongoing throughout the remainder of the SPDG Year 4. Madison and Houston County school systems have expressed interest in participation. The purpose of the Early Childhood Literacy Communities of Practice is to inform and support families in promoting early literacy activities for their young children. It is too early to report on the impact of Early Literacy Communities of Practice.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004  
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award #H323A070012

---

**SECTION B - Budget Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

During Year 4 of the grant the Latino Outreach Specialist became ill and has not been able to return to work. A replacement will be sought for Year 5.

---

**SECTION C - Additional Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

To better conduct SPDG activities in Year 4, the following changes were needed in the SPDG goals and objectives:

**1. Goal 1 - Implementation of scientifically-based instruction and interventions in reading and math,**

Percentage of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 teachers reporting that the Struggling Reader Course training was very helpful in implementing interventions in their classrooms.

This performance measure was changed in Year 4 to a focus on Planet Literacy training as the Struggling Reader materials were revised and no longer supported by GaDOE. Planet Literacy addressed the needs of middle and high school learners and provided the strategies that teachers requested.

## **2. Goal 2 – Reduction of Dropouts through participation in effective dropout prevention programs/strategies, including behavior interventions.**

Percentage of Cohort participants receiving LRE/Co-Teaching Training who reported that the ongoing support received following training was very helpful in implementing school and classroom interventions.

This performance measure was dropped in Year 4 because it was scaled up to being a statewide activity funded by other sources and tied into state Part B monitoring.

Number or percent of IHE staff reporting increased knowledge of SBR reading and math interventions and/or effective dropout prevention strategies for students with disabilities as a result of receiving training satisfaction through bi-annual university forums.

Number or percent of IHEs that report infusion of SBR reading and math interventions and/or dropout prevention programs/strategies:

This activity shifted to a focus to better meet the needs of IHEs through increasing interaction with their school districts. As a result of the University Forum held in Year 3 of the grant universities, school districts and Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) centers worked as teams and action plans were developed around needs to increase the number of certified special education teachers. Universities applied for minigrants and implemented the plans during year 4.

## **3. Goal 3 - Transition**

Because state monitoring results found that a number of school districts in Georgia had difficulties implementing the State's Indicator 13 (Transition), a SPDG performance measure was added to provide training for increased knowledge regarding compliant transition plans.

## **4. Goal 4 – Recruitment and Retention**

**Objective 4.1:** Special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate will be reduced from 38% to 10%.

Objective 4.1 was combined with Objective 4.2 as data on number of special education teachers holding a non-regular certificate was not available this year from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) as in previous years due to budget cuts.

Georgia's Induction Program for new special education teachers was implemented during Year 4 of the SPDG. Four SPDG performance measures were added to monitor the progress and outcomes of the Induction Program.

## **5. Goal 5 – Parent Participation**

5.1.a – Percentage of Head Start, day care, and other early intervention programs participants reporting a four on a four-point rating scale that the *Get Ready to Read* training met their needs regarding ways to use the screening and learning activities.



5.1.b – Increased literacy skills of young children served by Georgia child care providers, Head Start, and regional providers, as measured by pre/post data within the *Get Ready to Read* Program.

The collaboration with other agencies in providing the Get Ready to Read Training did not result in a sufficient audience or interest among the providers to continue this initiative. GaDOE shifted the emphasis of this objective to partner with the state’s Parent Training Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, to support Early Literacy Communities of Practice; and, therefore, we are reporting in Year 4 on the “Percentage of parents reporting positive benefits from the work of Early Literacy Communities of Practice” under Objective 5.1.